arXiv:1612.08373v1 [math.DS] 26 Dec 2016

# GEOMETRICAL MODELS FOR REDUCIBLE PISOT SUBSTITUTIONS

BENOIT LORIDANT AND MILTON MINERVINO

Abstract. We set up a geometrical theory for the study of the dynamics of reducible Pisot substitutions. It is based on certain Rauzy fractals generated by duals of higher dimensional extensions of substitutions. We obtain under certain hypotheses geometric representations of stepped surfaces and related polygonal tilings, as well as self-replicating and periodic tilings made of Rauzy fractals. We apply our theory to an infinite family of substitutions. For this family, we analyze and interpret in a new combinatorial way the codings of a domain exchange defined on the associated fractal domains. We deduce that the symbolic dynamical systems associated with this family of substitutions behave dynamically as first returns of toral translations.

## 1. Introduction

A *substitution* is a map that takes letters of some finite alphabet to finite words in that alphabet. It is *Pisot* if the dominant eigenvalue of its incidence matrix $M_\sigma$ is a Pisot number. The difference between *irreducible* and *reducible* is whether the characteristic polynomial of $M_\sigma$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ or not. For more detailed definitions we refer to Section 2.1.

The *substitutive system* $(X_\sigma, S)$ is the action of the shift on the set of bi-infinite words all of whose finite words are factors of some iterations of the substitution on some letter. If the substitution is primitive $(X_\sigma, S)$ is minimal and uniquely ergodic. One of the main aims is to understand the spectral behavior of such a system. The Pisot hypothesis guarantees the existence of a Kronecker factor and is crucial in Rauzy's work [Rau82] where the geometrical theory for these systems based on *Rauzy fractals* was initiated. In this work it was shown that the substitutive system generated by the Tribonacci substitution is a translation on a two-dimensional torus. The key point was to interpret the shift as a domain exchange on a compact self-similar domain of $\mathbb{C}$, later called Rauzy fractal. Furthermore, this fractal domain tiles periodically $\mathbb{C}$. This geometrical construction was generalized in [AI01]: they showed that the substitutive system associated with any unimodular irreducible Pisot substitution satisfying a combinatorial hypothesis, called strong coincidence condition, is measurably conjugate to a domain exchange on the Rauzy fractal. The problem of understanding whether $(X_\sigma, S)$ has pure discrete spectrum, or equivalently if the Rauzy fractals tile periodically their representation space, is known as *Pisot conjecture* and is still open for irreducible Pisot substitutions (see [ABB$^+$15] for a survey and [Bar16, Bar15] for recent results).

*Date*: December 28, 2016.

This research is supported by the ANR/FWF project "FAN – Fractals and Numeration" (ANR-12-IS01-0002, FWF grant I1136) of the French National Agency for Research (ANR) and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF).

**The reducible settings.** The reducible framework is much more enigmatic and less studied in comparison with the irreducible one. One of the main reasons is the lack of some important tools and the existence of some significant differences.

A reducible Pisot substitution acts on an alphabet with $n$ symbols with $n$ greater than the degree $d$ of its Pisot number. The space $\mathbb{R}^n$ splits into an $M_\sigma$-invariant hyperbolic space, with a one-dimensional expanding and a $(d-1)$-dimensional contracting spaces, and a neutral space, that in this work we consider non-hyperbolic. One complication is to understand the influence of this neutral space in the dynamics and geometry of the substitution.

*Stepped surfaces* play an important role in construct tilings by Rauzy fractals. They were first defined in [Rev91] and used as arithmetic discrete models for hyperplanes e.g. in [IO93, IO94]. The concept of stepped surface plays a central role in [AI01] in the irreducible substitution context, where it is defined as the set of nearest colored integer points above the contracting space $\mathbb{K}_c$ of the substitution $\sigma$:

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(\mathbf{x}, a) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathcal{A} : \pi_e(\mathbf{x}) \in [0, \pi_e(\mathbf{e}_a))\}. \tag{1.1}$$

This is a cut-and-project set, in particular a model set, with window in the expanding line. To any colored integer point one can associate a face of an hypercube of $\mathbb{R}^n$ of a certain type. The resulting union of faces provides a discrete approximation of the contracting space and is called a geometrical representation of the stepped surface. Its projection onto $\mathbb{K}_c$ is a polygonal tiling. If we replace these polygons by the Rauzy fractals we obtain generally a self-replicating multiple tiling. The main aim is to determine whether this collection forms a tiling. It was shown in [IR06] that this is equivalent to having a periodic tiling by Rauzy fractals related to a domain exchange transformation and one related to a Markov partition of the toral automorphism $M_\sigma$. Rauzy fractals are intimately connected with stepped surfaces since they are defined as attractors of a graph-directed iterated function system governed by the *dual substitution* $\mathbf{E}_1^*(\sigma)$ and this dual substitution acts on elements of the stepped surface. Topological properties of Rauzy fractals generated by reducible Pisot substitutions were studied in [ST09].

As pointed out in [EIR06], the existence of a geometrical representation of a stepped surface in the reducible case is unclear. In this paper, the authors defined an abstract stepped surface similarly as in (1.1) as set of nearest colored points and they showed its invariance under the dual substitution $\mathbf{E}_1^*(\sigma)$. However no concrete geometrical realization was given. An ad hoc construction for a geometrical stepped surface was given in [EI05] for the reducible substitution associated with the minimal Pisot number, also known as Hokkaido substitution.

In [EIR06] a self-replicating collection made of Rauzy fractals and one related to the Markov partition for the toral automorphism of the substitution were studied. However, they showed that there exist reducible Rauzy fractals which cannot tile periodically. This is a significant difference with respect to the irreducible setting. For the Hokkaido substitution it was shown in [EI05] that an extended domain of the Rauzy fractal tiles indeed periodically. This can be explained with the results of [BBK06, Proposition 8.5]: for a wide class of $\beta$-substitutions, the domain exchange on the Rauzy fractal is shown to be the first return of a minimal toral translation on it. The extended fundamental domain is explained by taking into account the original Rauzy fractal together with the pieces prior to their first return.

Note that the Pisot conjecture is not true for reducible Pisot substitutions, see e.g. the Thue-Morse substitution and [BBK06, Example 5.3]. On the other hand,

all Pisot $\beta$-substitutions have tiling dynamical systems with pure discrete spectrum [Bar16, Bar15]. However this was proven for the $\mathbb{R}$-action of translation on the convex hull of the tiling of the line induced by the substitution. Our aim is to understand the $\mathbb{Z}$-action $(X_\sigma, S)$ and, as far as we know, very little is understood.

Remark that reducible non-unimodular Pisot substitutions raised particular interest since recently irreducibility has been criticized to be a natural assumption. Indeed one can take an irreducible Pisot substitution and rewrite it to obtain another substitution that is not irreducible but has topologically conjugate dynamics. In [BBJS12] a topological condition on the first rational Cĕch cohomology of the tiling space of the substitution is introduced. Pisot substitutions satisfying this condition are called *homological* and it is conjectured that their tiling spaces are $m$-to-1 extensions of their maximal equicontinuous factor (a torus or a solenoid), where $m$ is a divisor of the norm of the Pisot number.

**Results of this paper.** In this paper we set up a geometrical theory for the dynamics of reducible Pisot substitutions. We take inspiration from some ideas of [AFHI11] for the study of a free group automorphism associated with a complex Pisot root. The main tools are the duals of higher dimensional extensions of substitutions (Section 3), first introduced in [SAI01]. Since we want to construct fractal tilings on the contracting space $\mathbb{K}_c \cong \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ of the substitution, we want to work with $(d-1)$-dimensional faces in $\mathbb{R}^n$, thus it turns out that the dual substitution $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)$, and its concrete geometric realization $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$, will be suitable for this task. Our Rauzy fractals will be defined as Hausdorff limits of renormalized patches of polygons generated by iterations of the dual $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$. In the irreducible case these fractals coincide with the usual ones, thus our theory is more general.

We introduce some important geometrical and algebraic conditions in order to develop a tiling theory with these objects (see Section 4.2 for precise definitions). We deal with *nice reducible substitutions*, a condition which implies that $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ is an authentic substitution, in the sense that it induces an inflate-and-subdivide rule on $\mathbb{K}_c$, it is positive (as defined in [AFHI11]) and has exactly the Pisot number as inflation factor. The *geometric finiteness property* will ensure that the stepped surfaces cover the entire space $\mathbb{K}_c$. Finally we define a slight generalization of the *strong coincidence condition* to ensure that a domain exchange is well-defined on the subtiles of the Rauzy fractals.

Under these conditions, we solve some well-known problems for reducible Pisot substitution posed e.g. in [EIR06]:

- We find geometrical representations for stepped surfaces and related polygonal tilings (Theorem 1 in Section 4).
- We show that our Rauzy fractals form *aperiodic self-replicating tilings* by just replacing them in the polygonal tiling induced by a stepped surface (Theorem 2 in Section 5).
- We get natural *periodic tilings* by Rauzy fractals, which were missing in the previous works on reducible substitutions (Theorem 3 in Section 5).

Our Rauzy fractals turn out to be exactly those extended domains considered in [EI05, BBK06], with the advantage that they are generated explicitly in a systematic way by the dual substitution $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$. We apply our results in Section 6 to an infinite family of substitutions. Here we relate also different approaches for defining Rauzy fractals. Rauzy fractals can be defined also as the closure of the projection

of vertices of the *broken line* representing geometrically the fixed point of the substitution. We give a new combinatorial approach which consists in applying a morphism, defined by taking into account the rational dependencies arising in the reducible case, to the broken line. This morphism turns in some sense the broken line into an irreducible one, considering only the letters associated with the rationally independent generators (cf. [Fre05] for a similar approach in the framework of model sets for reducible substitutions). Projecting the vertices of this modified broken line onto $\mathbb{K}_c$ is an equivalent definition of the Rauzy fractal generated by $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$. We investigate then the codings of the domain exchange defined on our new Rauzy fractals. We conclude by showing that, for our family of substitution, $(X_\sigma, S)$ is measurably conjugate to the first return of a toral translation (Theorem 5). We end with Section 7 where some perspectives for future works are presented.



FIGURE 1. Polygonal and Rauzy fractals aperiodic tiling induced by the stepped surface generated by the patch $\mathcal{U} = \{(\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 3), (\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 4), (\mathbf{0}, 3\wedge 4)\}$ for the Hokkaido substitution (see Section 6).

## 2. General setting

2.1. **Pisot substitutions.** Let $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ be a finite alphabet. A *substitution* $\sigma$ is an endomorphism of the free monoid $\mathcal{A}^*$ sending non-empty words to non-empty words. Its *incidence matrix* $M_\sigma$ is defined by $(M_\sigma)_{b,a} = |\sigma(a)|_b$, for $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, where $|w|_b$ is the number of occurrences of the letter $b$ in $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$. Denote by $\mathbf{l} : \mathcal{A}^* \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $w_0 \cdots w_k \mapsto \mathbf{e}_{w_0} + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{w_k}$ the *abelianization map*. Then $\mathbf{l} \circ \sigma = M_\sigma \circ \mathbf{l}$. We say that a substitution $\sigma$ is *primitive* if $M_\sigma$ is primitive. By the Perron-Frobenius theorem a primitive matrix has a dominant simple eigenvalue. A *Pisot substitution* is a substitution such that the dominant eigenvalue of $M_\sigma$ is a *Pisot number*, i.e. an algebraic integer $\beta > 1$ such that its Galois conjugates $\beta'$ other than $\beta$ itself satisfy $|\beta'| < 1$. We say that a Pisot substitution is *unit* if the Pisot number $\beta$ is a unit, that is, its norm $N(\beta) = \pm 1$. Given a Pisot substitution $\sigma$ suppose that the characteristic polynomial of $M_\sigma$ decomposes over $\mathbb{Q}$ into irreducible factors as

$$\det(xI - M_\sigma) = f(x)g_1(x)^{m_1} \cdots g_k(x)^{m_k},$$

where $f(x)$ is the minimal polynomial of the Pisot root $\beta$. We call $f(x)$ the *Pisot polynomial* and $g(x) := g_1(x)^{m_1} \cdots g_k(x)^{m_k}$ the *neutral polynomial* associated to $\sigma$. If $g(x) = 1$ we say that the substitution $\sigma$ is *irreducible*, otherwise we call it *reducible*. An irreducible Pisot substitution is primitive (see [CS01, Proposition 1.3]), but this is not true in general for reducible Pisot substitutions.

The *prefix* and *suffix graphs* of the substitution are defined by having $\mathcal{A}$ as set of nodes and edges $a \xrightarrow{p} b$, respectively $a \xrightarrow{s} b$, whenever $\sigma(a) = pbs$, for $b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $p, s \in \mathcal{A}^*$.

2.2. **Representation space.** In this section we define all the necessary for the representation space where the Rauzy fractals will live.

Let $\{\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(r)}, \beta^{(r+1)}, \overline{\beta^{(r+1)}}, \dots, \beta^{(r+s)}, \overline{\beta^{(r+s)}}\}$ be the Galois conjugates of the Pisot number $\beta = \beta^{(1)}$. If $\deg(\beta) = d$ then $d = r + 2s$. Choose dual bases $\{\mathbf{u}_{\beta^{(i)}}\}_{i=1}^{r+s}$, $\{\mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}}\}_{i=1}^{r+s}$ of right, respectively left eigenvectors for $M_\sigma$ associated with the $\{\beta^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{r+s}$, such that each $\mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}} \in \mathbb{Z}[\beta]^n$ and renormalize $\mathbf{u}_\beta$ such that $\mathbf{u}_\beta \cdot \mathbf{v}_\beta = 1$.

There exists a unique $M_\sigma$-invariant decomposition $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{K}_\beta \oplus \mathbb{K}_n$, where the restriction of $M_\sigma$ to $\mathbb{K}_\beta$ is hyperbolic with characteristic polynomial $f(x)$. The *Pisot space* $\mathbb{K}_\beta$ is the direct sum of the eigenspaces associated with the $\{\beta^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{r+s}$. It has an expanding/contracting splitting $\mathbb{K}_\beta = \mathbb{K}_e \oplus \mathbb{K}_c$, where $\mathbb{K}_e = \mathbb{R}\mathbf{u}_\beta$ and $\mathbb{K}_c \cong \mathbb{R}^{r-1} \times \mathbb{C}^s$ is the $(d-1)$-dimensional linear subspace generated by the vectors $\{\mathbf{u}_{\beta^{(i)}}\}_{i=2}^{r+s}$. The *neutral space* $\mathbb{K}_n := f(M_\sigma)\mathbb{R}^n$ is generated by the eigenspaces associated with the roots of the neutral polynomial $g(x)$. Since $\mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}} \in \ker(f({}^tM_\sigma))$, we deduce that $\mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}} \perp \mathbb{K}_n$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r+s\}$. We equip each of these spaces with its appropriate (according to its nature and dimension) Lebesgue measure $\lambda$.

We consider the projections

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{K}_\beta, &\quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{r+s} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}} \rangle \mathbf{u}_{\beta^{(i)}} \\
\pi_e : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{K}_e, &\quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(1)}} \rangle \mathbf{u}_{\beta^{(1)}} \\
\pi_c : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{K}_c, &\quad \mathbf{x} \mapsto \sum_{i=2}^{r+s} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}} \rangle \mathbf{u}_{\beta^{(i)}}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\pi(\mathbb{Z}^n)$ is a full rank lattice in $\mathbb{K}_\beta$ and the $\{\pi(\mathbf{e}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are redundant generators, as indicated by the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *The vectors $\{\pi(\mathbf{e}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-linearly dependent.*

*Proof.* We know that $\{f(M_\sigma(\mathbf{e}_i)); i = 1, \dots, n\} \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$, since $f(M_\sigma)$ is not trivial. Let $i_0$ such that $f(M_\sigma(\mathbf{e}_{i_0})) =: \mathbf{y} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, because $M_\sigma$ has integer coefficients. Thus $\mathbf{y} = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \mathbf{e}_i$, where the $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ are not all 0. It follows that

$$\pi(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r+s} \langle \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}} \rangle \mathbf{u}_{\beta^{(i)}} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Indeed, $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{K}_n$ and all the $\mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}}$ are orthogonal to $\mathbb{K}_n$, as mentioned above. This gives the non trivial relation $\pi(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \pi(\mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ with integer coefficients. □

Since the $\mathbf{u}_{\beta^{(i)}}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{\beta^{(i)}}$ are right and respectively left eigenvectors of $M_\sigma$ associated with $\beta^{(i)}$, for $i = 1, \dots, r+s$, we have that $M_\sigma$ commutes with $\pi$, $\pi_e$ and $\pi_c$, and it is an expansion on $\mathbb{K}_e$ and a contraction on $\mathbb{K}_c$.

Given a measurable set $W \subseteq \mathbb{K}_c$, we have

$$\lambda(M_\sigma W) = \beta^{-1} \lambda(W). \tag{2.1}$$

Indeed, $M_\sigma$ is a uniform contraction whose eigenvalues are the Galois conjugates of $\beta$, and $|\beta^{(2)} \cdots \beta^{(r)}||\beta^{(r+1)}|^2 \cdots |\beta^{(r+s)}|^2 = \beta^{-1}$ since $\beta$ is a unit.

2.3. **Geometric interpretation of substitution dynamical systems.** Given a fixed point $u \in \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ of a Pisot substitution $\sigma$, consider

$$X_\sigma = \overline{\{S^k u : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}},$$

where $S : \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathcal{A}^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is the shift $S(u_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} = (u_{i+1})_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$. The symbolic dynamical system $(X_\sigma, S)$ is minimal (every orbit is dense) and uniquely ergodic (there exists a unique $S$-invariant measure $\mu$).

The *Rauzy fractal* $\mathcal{R}$ is the union of the subtiles $\mathcal{R}(a)$ defined as the projection of vertices of the broken line representing geometrically the fixed point $u$ of $\sigma$

$$\mathcal{R}(a) = \overline{\{\pi_c(\mathbf{l}(u_{[0,k)})) : k \in \mathbb{N}, u_k = a)\}}, \quad a \in \mathcal{A}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $u_{[0,k)} = u_0 \dots u_{k-1}$. We can use Dumont-Thomas numeration (see [DT89]) to define equivalently the subtiles $\mathcal{R}(a)$ as

$$\mathcal{R}(a) = \Big\{ \sum_{i\geq 0} \pi_c(M_\sigma^i \mathbf{l}(p_i)) : (p_i)_{i\geq 0} \in \mathcal{G}_p(a) \Big\}, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_p(a)$ denotes the set of labels of infinite paths in the prefix graph of the substitution ending at $a \in \mathcal{A}$ (for more details see e.g. [CS01, BS05]). We can follow as well infinite paths in the suffix graph. If we do this we get instead

$$-\mathcal{R}(a) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_a) = \Big\{ \sum_{i\geq 0} \pi_c(M_\sigma^i \mathbf{l}(s_i)) : (s_i)_{i\geq 0} \in \mathcal{G}_s(a) \Big\}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_s(a)$ denotes the set of labels of infinite paths in the suffix graph of the substitution ending at $a \in \mathcal{A}$ (see [CS01, Section 5]).

A substitution $\sigma$ satisfies the *strong coincidence condition* if for any $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}^2$ there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\sigma^k(i) \in p_1 a \mathcal{A}^*$ and $\sigma^k(j) \in p_2 a \mathcal{A}^*$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and words $p_1, p_2 \in \mathcal{A}^*$ with the same abelianization $\mathbf{l}(p_1) = \mathbf{l}(p_2)$. If the strong coincidence condition holds, the *domain exchange* on $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{a\in\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{R}(a)$ is defined $\lambda$-a.e. by

$$E : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_a), \quad \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}(a).$$

It was proved in [AI01, CS01] that, for each unit irreducible Pisot substitution satisfying the strong coincidence condition, $(X_\sigma, S, \mu)$ is measurably conjugate to the exchange of domains $(\mathcal{R}, E, \lambda)$. It is mentioned in [EIR06] that this measure-theoretical conjugacy holds even in the reducible case.

2.4. **Standing assumptions.** For the rest of the paper we will always assume that $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and $\sigma$ is a primitive unit Pisot substitution with Pisot root $\beta$ such that $\deg(\beta) = d \leq n$.

## 3. Higher dimensional duals

We recall the definition and main properties of $k$-dimensional extensions of a substitution and their dual, first defined in [SAI01].

3.1. **Faces.** Let $\mathcal{O}_k$ be the set of elements $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_k \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^k \mathcal{A}$ with $a_1 < \dots < a_k$. Let $C_k$ be the free $\mathbb{Z}$-module with basis elements in $\mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathcal{O}_k$. An element $(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_k) \in C_k$ is called a *$k$-dimensional face* and consists of its *base point* $\mathbf{x}$ and of its *type* $\underline{a} := a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_k$. We shall think of $C_k$ as the vector space of formal finite integer weighted sums of $k$-dimensional faces. We also define $(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_k)$ for more general cases as follows.

- $(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \dots \wedge a_k) = 0$ if $a_i = a_j$ for some $i, j$.

- Antisymmetry: $(\mathbf{x}, a_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{\tau(k)}) = \mathrm{sgn}(\tau)(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)$, where $\mathrm{sgn}(\tau)$ is the signature of the permutation $\tau$.

Observe that this justifies the wedge product as choice of notation.

Given a face $(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k) \in C_k$, its *support* is

$$\overline{(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)} := \left\{ \mathbf{x} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} t_i \mathbf{e}_{a_i} : t_i \in [0,1] \right\}.$$

For the element 0, the support is the empty set. For a general element of $C_k$, $P = \sum_{l=1}^{N} n_l(\mathbf{x}_l, \underline{a}_l)$ with $n_l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\underline{a}_l \in \mathcal{O}_k$ for all $l \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, the support is

$$\overline{P} := \bigcup_{l=1}^{N} \overline{(\mathbf{x}_l, \underline{a}_l)}.$$

Given two elements of $C_k$, $P = \sum_{l=1}^{N} n_l(\mathbf{x}_l, \underline{a}_l)$ and $Q = \sum_{l=1}^{N} n'_l(\mathbf{x}_l, \underline{a}_l)$ with $n_l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n'_l \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\underline{a}_l \in \mathcal{O}_k$ for all $l \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we write $P \subset Q$ whenever $\overline{P} \subset \overline{Q}$ and there exists $R = \sum_{l=1}^{N} n''_l(\mathbf{x}_l, \underline{a}_l)$ with $n''_l \geq 0$ such that $Q = P + R$. An element of $P \cap Q$ will be a face of $C_k$ appearing with a non-zero coefficient both in $P$ and $Q$.

Finally, an element $\sum_{l=1}^{N} n_l(\mathbf{x}_l, \underline{a}_l)$ with $n_l \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and $\underline{a}_l \in \mathcal{O}_k$ for all $l \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ is called *geometric*. We say that a face $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})$ is positive while $-(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})$ is negative.

3.2. **Notations.** Suppose that, for a given $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{A}$, we have $\sigma(a_i) = p_i b_i s_i$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and $b_i \in \mathcal{A}$. Then we let $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \ldots, p_k)$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \ldots, s_k)$ and write $\sigma(\underline{a}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{b}\mathbf{s}$.

We denote by $\mathrm{Per}_k$ the set of permutations on $\{1, \ldots, k\}$. For $\tau \in \mathrm{Per}_k$ and $\underline{a} \in \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{A}$, the element $a_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{\tau(k)}$ will be written $\underline{a}_\tau$ for short.

Finally, we denote by $\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})$ and $\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s})$ the sum of the abelianizations of all prefixes $p_i$ appearing in $\mathbf{p}$, suffixes $s_i$ in $\mathbf{s}$ respectively.

3.3. **Extensions and their duals.**

**Definition 3.1.** The *k-dimensional extension* of $\sigma$ is the linear map on $C_k$

$$\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) = \sum_{\sigma(\underline{a}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{b}\mathbf{s}} (M_\sigma \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}), \underline{b}). \tag{3.1}$$

Write $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})^*$ for the dual of the element $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) \in C_k$. Let $C_k^*$ be the free $\mathbb{Z}$-module generated by the basis elements $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})^*$. We are interested in the dual of $\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)$.

**Proposition 3.2.** *We have*

$$\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})^* = \sum_{\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}\mathbf{s}} \left(M_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})), \underline{b}\right)^* \tag{3.2}$$

*Proof.* Let $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})^* \in C_k^*$. By definition of the dual of the linear map $\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)$ and by (3.1), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle \mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)^*, (\mathbf{y}, b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_k) \rangle \\
&= \langle (\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)^*, \mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)(\mathbf{y}, b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_k) \rangle \\
&= \textstyle\sum_{\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{c}\mathbf{s}} \langle (\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)^*, (M_\sigma \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}), \underline{c}) \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

A term in this sum is non-zero only for those faces $(M_\sigma \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}), \underline{c})$ such that $M_\sigma \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathbf{x}$ and $\underline{c} = a_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{\tau(k)} =: \underline{a}_\tau$ for some permutation $\tau$ on $\{1, \dots, k\}$. The corresponding term is then equal to $\mathrm{sgn}(\tau)$. Thus, denoted $\mathbf{z} = M_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}))$, this means that $\mathrm{sgn}(\tau)(\mathbf{z}, b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_k)^*$ appears in the image $\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})^*$, with $\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}_\tau\mathbf{s}$. Now we can reorder it into $(\mathbf{z}, b_{\tau(1)} \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{\tau(k)})^*$ with $\sigma(\underline{b}_\tau) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}\mathbf{s}$ and rename. Hence we obtain

$$\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)^* = \textstyle\sum_{\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}\mathbf{s}} (M_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})), \underline{b})^*. \qquad \square$$

3.4. **Poincaré maps and dual substitutions.** The dual maps are abstract objects formally defined on the dual basis, which has no geometric interpretation. We will interpret geometrically duals of faces of dimension $k$ as faces of dimension $n-k$, in a Poincaré duality flavor (cf. [SAI01, AFHI11]).

**Definition 3.3.** The map $\varphi_k$ is defined by

$$\varphi_k : (\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)^* \mapsto (-1)^{a_1 + \cdots + a_k} (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_{a_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{a_k}, b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{n-k})$$

where $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ and $\{b_1, \dots, b_{n-k}\}$ form a partition of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $a_1 < \cdots < a_k$, $b_1 < \cdots < b_{n-k}$. If $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k$ we will write $\underline{a}^* = b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{n-k}$. We call $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}^*)$ the $(n-k)$-dimensional face *transverse* to $\underline{a}$.

It was shown in [SAI01] that this map commutes with the boundary and coboundary operators. Furthermore $\varphi_k$ is invertible. Now we can conjugate the dual maps by $\varphi_k$ to obtain explicit geometric realizations.

**Definition 3.4.** The *geometric dual map* $\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma)$ is defined as

$$\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma) \circ \varphi_{n-k} = \varphi_{n-k} \circ \mathbf{E}_{n-k}^*(\sigma).$$

In general we have $n = \#\mathcal{A} \geq d = \deg(\beta)$ with strict inequality for reducible substitutions. We want to represent the action of the substitution geometrically on $\mathbb{K}_c \cong \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, thus it makes sense to consider the action of a dual substitution on $(d-1)$-dimensional faces. For this reason we will work with the geometric realization $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ conjugate to $\mathbf{E}_{n-d+1}^*(\sigma)$ via $\varphi_{n-d+1}$ (note that if $\sigma$ is irreducible then the dual substitution is $\mathbf{E}_1^*(\sigma)$). An explicit formula for $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ reads as follows.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{n-d+1} \in \mathcal{O}_{n-d+1}$. Then the following holds for the $(d-1)$-dimensional face $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}^*)$ transverse to $\underline{a}$.*

$$\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}^*) = \sum_{\tau \in \mathrm{Per}_{n-d+1}} \sum_{\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}_\tau\mathbf{s}} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau)(-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}} \big(M_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s})), \underline{b}^*\big) \tag{3.3}$$

*where $(-1)^{\underline{a}}$ denotes $(-1)^{a_1 + \cdots + a_{n-d+1}}$. In this formula, $\underline{b} = b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{n-d+1} \in \mathcal{O}_{n-d+1}$.*

*Proof.* A face $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}^*)$ is sent by $\varphi_{n-d+1}^{-1}$ to $(-1)^{\underline{a}}(\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{e}_{a_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{a_{n-d+1}}), \underline{a})^*$.

Applying $\mathbf{E}_{n-d+1}^*(\sigma)$ we get the sum of all elements

$$\mathrm{sign}(\tau)(-1)^{\underline{a}} \big(M_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{e}_{a_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{a_{n-d+1}}) - (\mathbf{l}(p_1) + \cdots + \mathbf{l}(p_{n-d+1}))), \underline{b}\big)^*,$$

for $\tau \in \mathrm{Per}_{n-d+1}$, $\underline{b} = b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{n-d+1} \in \mathcal{O}_{n-d+1}$ and $\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}_\tau\mathbf{s}$.

Applying now $\varphi_{n-d+1}$ leads to the sum of all elements

$$\mathrm{sgn}(\tau)(-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}} \Big( M_\sigma^{-1}\big(\mathbf{x} - (\mathbf{l}(p_1 a_{\tau(1)}) + \cdots + \mathbf{l}(p_{n-d+1} a_{\tau(n-d+1)})) + \\ + M_\sigma(\mathbf{e}_{b_1} + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{b_{n-d+1}})\big), \underline{b}^* \Big),$$

again for $\tau \in \mathrm{Per}_{n-d+1}$ and $\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}_\tau\mathbf{s}$.

Therefore, since

$$M_\sigma \mathbf{e}_{b_i} = \mathbf{l}(\sigma(b_i)) = \mathbf{l}(p_i a_{\tau(i)}) + \mathbf{l}(s_i)$$

holds for all $i$, we get the result. □

Similar formulas hold for general $\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma)$. Notice that, since the geometric dual substitution $\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma)$ is conjugate to $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-k}(\sigma)$, it still depends on wedges of $n-k$ letters (see Equation (3.3) for $k = d-1$).

3.5. **Matrices.** We define here abelianizations of the $k$-dimensional extension $\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)$, of its dual map $\mathbf{E}^*_k(\sigma)$ and of the geometric realization $\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma)$ of the dual map $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-k}(\sigma)$ for a substitution $\sigma$. To this effect, we order the elements of $\mathcal{O}_k$ lexicographically and define the following matrices with entries indexed by pairs $(\underline{b}, \underline{a})$ of elements of $\mathcal{O}_k$.

*Matrix $B_k$ for $\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)$.* For $\underline{a} \in \mathcal{O}_k$, we rewrite (3.1) in such a way that $\underline{b} \in \mathcal{O}_k$ for all faces appearing in the formula:

$$\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) = \sum_{\underline{b}\in\mathcal{O}_k} \sum_{\tau\in\mathrm{Per}_k} \sum_{\sigma(\underline{a})=\mathbf{p}\underline{b}_\tau\mathbf{s}} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau)(M_\sigma\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}), \underline{b}).$$

Then

$$(B_k)_{\underline{b},\underline{a}} := \sum_{\tau\in\mathrm{Per}_k} \sum_{\sigma(\underline{a})=\mathbf{p}\underline{b}_\tau\mathbf{s}} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau) =: |\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)(\mathbf{0}, \underline{a})|_{\underline{b}} \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Here $|\cdot|_{\underline{b}}$ can be seen as the number of times a face of a given type $\underline{b} \in \mathcal{O}_k$ occurs (this number may be negative). Note that $B_1 = M_\sigma$. More generally, we have

$$B_k = \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} M_\sigma,$$

the $k$-th exterior product of the matrix $M_\sigma$, obtained by considering all the minors of order $k$ of the matrix $M_\sigma$. More precisely, the coefficient $(\underline{b} = b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_k, \underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k)$ of $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k M_\sigma$ is the minor obtained from $M_\sigma$ by keeping the rows $b_1, \ldots, b_k$ and the columns $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ of $M_\sigma$. The eigenvalues of $\bigwedge_{i=1}^k M_\sigma$ are the products of $k$ distinct eigenvalues of $M_\sigma$ (counted with their multiplicity).

*Matrix $M^*_k$ for the dual $\mathbf{E}^*_k(\sigma)$.* Similarly, we define

$$(M^*_k)_{\underline{b},\underline{a}} := \sum_{\tau\in\mathrm{Per}_k} \sum_{\sigma(\underline{b})=\mathbf{p}\underline{a}_\tau\mathbf{s}} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau) =: |\mathbf{E}^*_k(\sigma)(\mathbf{0}, \underline{a})^*|_{\underline{b}} \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and obviously we have the relation

$$M^*_k = {}^tB_k = \bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} {}^tM_\sigma.$$

Note that here $|\cdot|_{\underline{b}}$ counts the number of times a dual face of type $\underline{b}$ occurs.

*Matrix $M_k$ for the geometric dual map $\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma)$.* We finally define the matrix $M_k$ associated with the operator $\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma)$ by

$$(M_k)_{\underline{b}^*,\underline{a}^*} := \sum_{\tau\in \mathrm{Per}_{n-k}} \sum_{\sigma(\underline{b})=\mathbf{p}\underline{a}_\tau\mathbf{s}} \mathrm{sgn}(\tau)(-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}} =: |\mathbf{E}^k(\sigma)(\mathbf{0},\underline{a}^*)|_{\underline{b}^*} \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{3.4}$$

for $\underline{a},\underline{b}\in\mathcal{O}_{n-k}$. In other words,

$$(M_k)_{\underline{b}^*,\underline{a}^*} = (-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}}\left(M^*_{n-k}\right)_{\underline{b},\underline{a}} = (-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}}\left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-k} {}^tM_\sigma\right)_{\underline{b},\underline{a}}. \tag{3.5}$$

For this reason, the matrix $M_k$ will be written down with respect to the basis $\{\underline{a}^*;\underline{a}\in\mathcal{O}_{n-k}\}$, ordered in the same order as the elements of $\mathcal{O}_{n-k}$ (see Example 3.6).

We are mostly interested in $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ and $\mathbf{E}^{d-2}(\sigma)$. The matrices $M_{d-1}$ and $M_{d-2}$ describe respectively the growth of $(d-1)$ and $(d-2)$-dimensional faces in the images of $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ and $\mathbf{E}^{d-2}(\sigma)$.

*Example* 3.6. Let $\sigma: 1\mapsto 12,\ 2\mapsto 13,\ 3\mapsto 1$ be the Tribonacci substitution. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma): (\mathbf{0},2\wedge 3) &\mapsto (M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{e}_2, 2\wedge 3)\cup -(M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{e}_3, 1\wedge 3)\cup(\mathbf{0},1\wedge 2),\\
(\mathbf{0},1\wedge 3) &\mapsto -(\mathbf{0},2\wedge 3),\\
(\mathbf{0},1\wedge 2) &\mapsto -(\mathbf{0},1\wedge 3),\\
\mathbf{E}^1(\sigma): \quad (\mathbf{0},3) &\mapsto -(M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{e}_3,3)\cup(\mathbf{0},2)\\
(\mathbf{0},2) &\mapsto -(M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{e}_2,3)\cup(\mathbf{0},1)\\
(\mathbf{0},1) &\mapsto (\mathbf{0},3)
\end{aligned}$$

with matrices

$$M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0\\ -1 & 0 & -1\\ 1 & 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 & 1\\ 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0\end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix $M_2$ is written with respect to the basis $\{1^*,2^*,3^*\}$, and similarly $M_1$ is written with respect to the basis $\{(1\wedge 2)^*,(1\wedge 3)^*,(2\wedge 3)^*\}$. One can check (3.5) by comparing these matrices with

$$M_1^* = {}^tM_\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0\\ 1 & 0 & 1\\ 1 & 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}, \qquad M_2^* = {}^tM_\sigma\wedge{}^tM_\sigma = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 1 & 1\\ -1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & -1 & 0\end{pmatrix}.$$

*Remark* 3.7. Since by definition $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ is conjugate to $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)$ via $\varphi_{n-d+1}$, the matrix $M_{d-1}$ is conjugate to $M^*_{n-d+1}$, i.e. there exists $N\in\mathrm{GL}(\binom{n}{d-1},\mathbb{Z})$ such that

$$M^*_{n-d+1} = N^{-1}M_{d-1}N.$$

Furthermore we can choose $N$ to be a diagonal matrix with entries in $\{1,-1\}$. A similar approach treating $N$ was considered in [FIR06].

3.6. **Positivity and cancellation.** Even if $M_\sigma$ is a non-negative matrix, we have seen that the matrices $M_k^*$ and $M_{n-k}$ can have negative entries. This implies that cancellation may occur for $\mathbf{E}^*_k(\sigma)$ and $\mathbf{E}^{n-k}(\sigma)$.

There are two types of cancellation, as explained as follows. By definition the abelianization $M_k^*$ counts the elements occurring in the image of the dual $\mathbf{E}^*_k(\sigma)$, "forgetting" their base points. In particular, if two elements $(\mathbf{x},\underline{b})^*$ and $-(\mathbf{y},\underline{b})^*$ with $\mathbf{x}\neq\mathbf{y}$ occur in the image $\mathbf{E}^*_k(\sigma)(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})^*$, then they cancel in $M_k^*$, i.e. $(M_k^*)_{\underline{b},\underline{a}}=0$. This is an example of "bad cancellation": geometrically, the two elements should not cancel, as they both contribute to the total Lebesgue measure of $\mathbf{E}^{n-k}(\sigma)\varphi_k(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})^*$. The only "good cancellation" that $M_k^*$ takes into account is the cancellation of two

elements based at the same point and with the same type but opposite orientations. We rather wish to avoid bad cancellation in order to see $M_k^*$ as a faithful algebraic description of the substitution $\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)$.

We may be able to find a good orientation $\mathcal{O}_k$ such that each positively oriented element is sent by $\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)$ to a sum of positively oriented elements. If this is the case then $M_k^*$ is non-negative, no cancellation at all occurs, and $\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)$ behaves as a substitution. This is the concept of *positivity* defined in [AFHI11] and which will motivate our hypothesis (P) in Section 4.2.

An easy calculation based on the conjugacy between $\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)$ and $\mathbf{E}^{n-k}(\sigma)$ shows that the positivity of $\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)$ implies that for every $\underline{a} \in \mathcal{O}_{n-k}$, the faces of type $\underline{b}$ occurring in $\mathbf{E}^{n-k}(\sigma)(\mathbf{0}, \underline{a})$ all have the same orientation. This implies that no cancellation happens neither for $\mathbf{E}^{n-k}(\sigma)$.

3.7. **Boundary and coboundary operators.** All this can be done as in the classical simplicial homology and cohomology theory (see e.g. [Hat02]). The following considerations can be found in [SAI01].

There is a boundary operator which associates with a $k$-dimensional face its boundary consisting in a union of oriented $(k-1)$-dimensional faces.

**Definition 3.8.** The boundary operator $\partial : \cup_{k=1}^n C_k \to \cup_{k=0}^{n-1} C_k$ is defined on the basis elements $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})$ with $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k \in \mathcal{O}_k$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, by

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \partial(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) & = & \sum_{i=1}^k (-1)^i \left( (\mathbf{x}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{a_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k) \right. \\ & & \left. -(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{e}_{a_i}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{a_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k) \right) \end{array}$$

Here, $a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{a_i} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{i-1} \wedge a_{i+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_k$. For $k = 1$, we simply write $\widehat{a_i} := \bullet$.

By duality, a coboundary operator $\partial^* : \cup_{k=0}^{n-1} C_k^* \to \cup_{k=1}^n C_k^*$ acting on duals of faces can be defined as well. An explicit formula is given in [SAI01, Proposition 1.1]. Moreover, the Poincaré maps conjugate the boundary and coboundary operators:

$$\varphi_k \circ \partial^* = \partial \circ \varphi_{k-1}. \tag{3.6}$$

An important property is that the boundary and coboundary operators commute with $\mathbf{E}_k(\sigma)$ and $\mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma)$ respectively. More precisely,

$$\partial \circ \mathbf{E}_k(\sigma) = \mathbf{E}_{k-1}(\sigma) \circ \partial, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\partial^* \circ \mathbf{E}_k^*(\sigma) = \mathbf{E}_{k+1}^*(\sigma) \circ \partial^*. \tag{3.8}$$

Notice that positivity is not preserved under application of $\partial$ or $\partial^*$.

To derive geometric properties of the Rauzy fractals associated with a substitution, we will be interested in the geometric realizations $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ and $\mathbf{E}^{d-2}(\sigma)$ of the duals of a substitution. Note that it follows from Equation (3.8), (3.6) and Definition 3.4 that

$$\partial \circ \mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma) = \mathbf{E}^{d-2}(\sigma) \circ \partial. \tag{3.9}$$

We will see in Section 4.3 that the formula (3.9) will play a prominent role in describing $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ as an inflate-and-subdivide rule.

## 4. Stepped surfaces

In this section, we give the general construction for the stepped surface of a unimodular Pisot substitution. We introduce in Section 4.2 and 4.4 some fundamental properties in order for the stepped surface of the substitution to be well-defined and have the expected properties. We use some terminology of [AFHI11]. Recall that $n = \#\mathcal{A}$ and $d = \deg(\beta)$ and, from Section 3.1, that a geometric element of $C_{d-1}$ is an element $\sum_{(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})\in\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathcal{O}_{d-1}} n_{(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})}(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})$ with only finitely many non-zero $n_{(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})} \in \{-1,1\}$.

**Definition 4.1.** A geometric element $P = \sum_{(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})\in\mathbb{Z}^n\times\mathcal{O}_{d-1}} n_{(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})}(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})$ is said to *project well onto* $\mathbb{K}_c$ if the projections $\pi_c(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})$ of distinct faces $(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})$ of $P$ have mutually disjoint interiors.

A *tiling* of $\mathbb{K}_c$ is a covering of $\mathbb{K}_c$ by compact sets such that Lebesgue almost every point of $\mathbb{K}_c$ is contained in exactly one element of the covering.

A *stepped surface* $\Gamma$ is a union of $(d-1)$-dimensional faces such that $\pi_c(\overline{\Gamma})$ is a (polygonal) tiling of $\mathbb{K}_c$.

We look for a stepped surface invariant under (a power of) $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$. Let $\mathcal{U} \in C_{d-1}$ be a geometric element of $(d-1)$-dimensional faces based at $\mathbf{0}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{U}$ projects well and that there exists an integer $m \geq 1$ such that $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^m(\mathcal{U})$ is geometric and satisfies $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^m(\mathcal{U})$. We associate to such a geometric element $\mathcal{U}$ the following potential candidate for a stepped surface:

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}} := \bigcup_{k\geq 0} \{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^{mk}(\mathcal{U})\}. \tag{4.1}$$

### 4.1. Faces near to $\mathbb{K}_c$.

Let

$$\mathcal{S}^* = \{(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})^* : \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \underline{a} \in \mathcal{O}_{n-d+1}, \pi_e(\mathbf{x}) \in [-\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(\underline{a})), \mathbf{0})\}.$$

**Proposition 4.2.** $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)(\mathcal{S}^*) = \mathcal{S}^*$.

*Proof.* First we show that an element $(\mathbf{y},\underline{b})^* \in \mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)(\mathcal{S}^*)$ is in $\mathcal{S}^*$. We have that $(\mathbf{y},\underline{b})^*$ is of the form $(M_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{l}(\underline{p})),\underline{b})^*$ for some $(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})^* \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and $\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}\mathbf{s}$. We must show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_e(M_\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}))) \in [-\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(\underline{b})),\mathbf{0}) &\iff \pi_e(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})) \in [-M_\sigma\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(\underline{b})),\mathbf{0}) \\
&\iff \pi_e(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})) \in [-\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(\sigma(\underline{b}))),\mathbf{0}) \\
&\iff \pi_e(\mathbf{x}) \in [-\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(\sigma(\underline{b}))-\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})),\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})) \\
&\iff \pi_e(\mathbf{x}) \in [-\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(\underline{a}\mathbf{s})),\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}))
\end{aligned}$$

and this is true since $\pi_e(\mathbf{x}) \in [-\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\underline{a}),\mathbf{0})$ and $-\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\underline{a}\mathbf{s}) \leq -\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\underline{a})$, $\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}) \geq 0$.

Now we must show that every element of $\mathcal{S}^*$ can be written as an element of $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)(\mathcal{S}^*)$. Let $(\mathbf{y},\underline{b})^* \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and consider $\mathcal{C} = \{M_\sigma\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}) : \sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}\mathbf{s}\}$. Each element in this set satisfies $\pi_e(M_\sigma\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})) \in [-\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\underline{a}\mathbf{s}),\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}))$. We claim that there exist at least one $\mathbf{p}$ and $\underline{a}$ such that $\mathbf{x} = M_\sigma\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})$ is such that $\pi_e(\mathbf{x}) \in [-\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\underline{a}),\mathbf{0})$, hence $(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})^* \in \mathcal{S}^*$ and $(\mathbf{y},\underline{b})^* \in \mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})^*$.

If $\sigma(\underline{b}) = \underline{a}$ for some $\underline{a}$ and $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{s} = \epsilon$, then $\pi_e(M_\sigma\mathbf{y}) \in [-\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\sigma(\underline{b})),\mathbf{0}) = [-\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\underline{a}),\mathbf{0})$ and we have the claim. Let $\sigma(\underline{b}) = \mathbf{p}\underline{a}\mathbf{s}$ such that $\mathbf{p}$ is the largest possible, or equivalently such that $\mathbf{s} = \epsilon$. If $\pi_e(M_\sigma\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})) < 0$ then $\pi_e(M_\sigma\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})) \in [-\pi_e\mathbf{l}(\underline{a}),0)$. If this is not the case, reduce $\mathbf{p}$ of one letter, say $a$, and let $\mathbf{p}_a$ be $\mathbf{p}$ without $a$. Notice that, if $(M_\sigma\mathbf{y}+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}),b_1\wedge b_2\wedge\cdots\wedge b_{n-d+1}) \in \mathcal{C}$, then

$(M_\sigma \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}_a), a \wedge b_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{n-d+1}) \in \mathcal{C}$. Suppose without loss of generality that $\pi_e(M_\sigma \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}_a)) < 0$, otherwise keep subtracting one letter from $\mathbf{p}$ until we have that this condition is satisfied. Then, if

$$\pi_e(M_\sigma \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p}_a)) < -\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(a \wedge b_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{n-d+1}))$$

this implies

$$\pi_e(M_\sigma \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{p})) < -\pi_e(\mathbf{l}(b_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{n-d+1})) < 0,$$

and we get a contradiction. Thus the claim follows. □

**Definition 4.3.** The set of *faces near to* $\mathbb{K}_c$ is $\mathcal{S} := \varphi_{n-d+1}(\mathcal{S}^*)$.

It follows from Definition 3.4 and Proposition 4.2 that $\mathcal{S}$ is invariant under $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$.

There is no clear interpretation of $\mathcal{S}$ as a stepped surface. We will show in Theorem 1 that, under certain hypotheses, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}} \subset \mathcal{S}$ is a stepped surface. This set depends heavily on the starting patch $\mathcal{U}$ that we start with. Intuitively we have that the iterations of $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ on $\mathcal{U}$ filter some elements of $\mathcal{S}$ which, seen as colored points near to $\mathbb{K}_c$, generate a good translation set for a tiling, namely a *Delone set*, i.e. a uniformly discrete and relatively dense set.

*Remark* 4.4. In the irreducible settings, it is proven in [AI01, Lemma 2, Lemma 3] that the stepped surface is invariant under $\mathbf{E}_1^*(\sigma)$ and that two distinct faces have disjoint images. In our case, the invariance of $\mathcal{S}^*$ is clear by Proposition 4.2, however the following examples show that $\mathbf{E}_{n-d+1}^*(\sigma)$ may fail to be injective outside of $\mathcal{S}^*$ as well as on $\mathcal{S}^*$.

Consider $\sigma_1$ of the family defined in Section 6. Then

$$(-M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(11), 1 \wedge 2 \wedge 4)^* \in \mathbf{E}_3^*(\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 3 \wedge 5)^* \cap \mathbf{E}_3^*(\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 3 \wedge 1)^*.$$

since the images

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}_3^*(\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 3 \wedge 5)^* &= (-M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(1), 1 \wedge 2 \wedge 4)^* + (-M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(11), 1 \wedge 2 \wedge 4)^* \\ &\quad + (-M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(1), 5 \wedge 2 \wedge 4)^*, \\ \mathbf{E}_3^*(\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 3 \wedge 1)^* &= (-M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(11), 1 \wedge 2 \wedge 4)^* + (-M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(11), 1 \wedge 2 \wedge 5)^*.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $(\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 3 \wedge 5)^*, (\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 3 \wedge 1)^* \notin \mathcal{S}^*$. On the other hand, if we consider $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}^2(\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 4) &= (M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(12), 3 \wedge 5) + (M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(2), 3 \wedge 5) + (\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 3) \\ \mathbf{E}^2(\mathbf{0}, 4 \wedge 5) &= (M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(5), 3 \wedge 5) + (\mathbf{0}, 3 \wedge 4)\end{aligned}$$

and the two images are disjoint.

As a second example, for $(-M_\sigma \mathbf{e}_4, 1 \wedge 3 \wedge 4)^*, (-M_\sigma \mathbf{e}_4 + \mathbf{e}_1, 1 \wedge 3 \wedge 4)^* \in \mathcal{S}^*$, we have

$$(-\mathbf{e}_4, 1 \wedge 2 \wedge 3)^* \in \mathbf{E}_3^*(\sigma)(-M_\sigma \mathbf{e}_4, 1 \wedge 3 \wedge 4)^* \cap \mathbf{E}_3^*(\sigma)(-M_\sigma \mathbf{e}_4 + \mathbf{e}_1, 1 \wedge 3 \wedge 4)^*,$$

thus $\mathbf{E}_3^*(\sigma)$ is not injective on $\mathcal{S}^*$.

4.2. **The hypotheses.** The following definition will be fundamental to achieve the next results.

**Definition 4.5.** We say that $\sigma$ is a *nice reducible substitution* if:

- (S1) $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U)$ is geometric and projects well, for all $U \in \mathcal{S}$.
- (S2) for any distinct $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $U_1 + U_2$ projects well onto $\mathbb{K}_c$, then $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_1)$ and $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_2)$ are disjoint and $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_1 + U_2)$ projects well onto $\mathbb{K}_c$.
- (P) The image by $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)$ of a positive face is the sum of positive faces, and the matrix $M^*_{n-d+1} = \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} {}^tM_\sigma$ is primitive.
- (N) The neutral polynomial $g(x)$ has only roots of modulus one and $g(0) = 1$.

(S1) and (S2) will assure that $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ satisfies an inflation-and-subdivision rule (see Proposition 4.9) and play a prominent role in Theorem 1.

(P) is the concept of *positivity* introduced in [AFHI11] together with the primitivity of the matrix. It is thoroughly explained in Section 3.6 and implies, in particular, that $\mathcal{O}_{n-d+1}$ is a convenient orientation for $M^*_{n-d+1}$ to be non-negative and that no cancellation occurs neither for $\mathbf{E}^*_{n-d+1}(\sigma)$ nor for $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$.

(N) is an algebraic assumption on the neutral polynomial so that the dominant eigenvalue of $|M_{d-1}|$ is the Pisot root $\beta$ (see Lemma 4.6).

The substitutions of the family considered in Section 6 are all nice reducible substitutions (see Proposition 6.1).

4.3. **The inflate-and-subdivide rule.** Define the absolute value of a matrix $M = (m_{ij})$ to be the matrix $|M| = (|m_{ij}|)$.

**Lemma 4.6.** *If $\sigma$ is a nice reducible substitution then the dominant eigenvalue of $|M_{d-1}|$ is $\beta$.*

*Proof.* We deduce from (3.5) and from (P) that

$$|M_{d-1}| = \left| \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} {}^tM_\sigma \right| = \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} {}^tM_\sigma = M^*_{n-d+1}.$$

The eigenvalues of $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} {}^tM_\sigma$ are the products of $n-d+1$ distinct eigenvalues of $M_\sigma$, counted with multiplicity. Since $M^*_{n-d+1}$ is primitive, it has a dominant eigenvalue, which, by (N), is $\beta \prod_i \zeta_i = \beta$, where the $\zeta_i$ are the $n-d$ roots of the unimodular neutral polynomial $g(x)$. Indeed, all other products of $n-d+1$ distinct eigenvalues of $M_\sigma$ are less than $\beta$, since they would include one Galois conjugate of the Pisot number $\beta$. □

**Lemma 4.7.** *If $\sigma$ is a nice reducible substitution then the vector $(\lambda(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}})))_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}}$ is an eigenvector of $|{}^tM_{d-1}|$ for the eigenvalue $\beta$.*

The proof is technical, it can be found in the Appendix.

We introduce now the important concept of inflate-and-subdivide rule. This is usually defined in the context of tiling spaces, which is slightly different than ours in terms of notations. A *tile* in $\mathbb{R}^k$ is defined as a pair $T = (F, t)$ where $F = \mathrm{supp}(T)$ (the support of $T$) is a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^k$ which is the closure of its interior, and $t$ is the type of $T$. We deal with particular tiles, namely only with faces $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})$ whose support is denoted by $\overline{(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})}$ and whose type is $\underline{a}$. The following is the definition of inflate-and-subdivide rule adapted to our notations.

**Definition 4.8.** Let $\alpha$ be an expanding linear transformation of $\mathbb{R}^k$ (all its eigenvalues are greater than one in modulus). A geometric substitution $\omega$ acting on a subset of $C_k$ induces an *inflate-and-subdivide rule* on $\mathbb{R}^k$ with expansion $\alpha$ if $\pi_k(\overline{\omega(P)}) = \alpha(\pi_k(\overline{P}))$ for every geometric element $P$ which projects well onto $\mathbb{R}^k$, and where $\pi_k$ denotes a projection of $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^k$. It induces an *imperfect inflate-and-subdivide rule* with expansion $\alpha$ if $\pi_k(\overline{\omega(P)}) \neq \alpha(\pi_k(\overline{P}))$ but $\lambda(\pi_k(\overline{\omega(P)})) = \lambda(\alpha(\pi_k(\overline{P})))$.

It is clear that $\mathbf{E}_1(\sigma)$ induces an inflate-and-subdivide rule on $\mathbb{K}_e$ with expansion $M_\sigma|_{\mathbb{K}_e}$. The following proposition states that the geometric substitution $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ induces an inflate-and-subdivide rule on $\mathbb{K}_c$ with expansion $M_\sigma^{-1}|_{\mathbb{K}_c}$.

**Proposition 4.9.** *If $\sigma$ is a nice reducible substitution then $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma) : \mathcal{S} \to \mathcal{S}$ induces an imperfect inflate-and-subdivide rule on $\mathbb{K}_c$ with expansion $\alpha = M_\sigma^{-1}|_{\mathbb{K}_c}$:*

$$\lambda(\pi_c\,\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(P)}) = \lambda(M_\sigma^{-1}\pi_c(\overline{P})) = \beta\,\lambda(\pi_c(\overline{P})).$$

*Proof.* We start to show that $\lambda(\pi_c\,\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})}) = \lambda(M_\sigma^{-1}\pi_c\overline{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})})$ for all the proto-faces $(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})$. By (S1) and (C), the element $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})$ is geometric and contains exactly $|(M_{d-1})_{\underline{b},\underline{a}}| = |({}^tM_{d-1})_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}|$ faces of type $\underline{b}$. Since this element even projects well, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\pi_c\,\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})}) &= \sum_{\underline{b}\in\mathcal{O}_{d-1}} |({}^tM_{d-1})_{\underline{a},\underline{b}}|\,\lambda(\pi_c\overline{(\mathbf{0},\underline{b})}) \\ &= \beta\,\lambda(\pi_c\overline{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})}) \\ &= \lambda(M_\sigma^{-1}\,\pi_c\overline{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})}).\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

In the first equality, we used that the projection of a face of type $\underline{b}$ has measure $\lambda(\pi_c\overline{(\mathbf{0},\underline{b})})$, independently of its base point. The second equality follows from Lemma 4.7 and the third equality from (2.1).

Let $U_1$, $U_2$ be two faces of the geometric element $P$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_1+U_2)})) &= \lambda(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_1)})) + \lambda(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_2)})) \\ &= \lambda(M_\sigma^{-1}\pi_c(\overline{U_1})) + \lambda(M_\sigma^{-1}\pi_c(\overline{U_2})) \\ &= \beta\,\lambda(\pi_c(\overline{U_1+U_2}))\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is true by (S2), the second by (4.2) and the third by 2.1. Since this is true for any couple of faces appearing in $P$ we have shown the result. □

*Remark* 4.10. The procedure of inflation and subdivision is described precisely by the formula

$$\mathbf{E}^{d-2}(\sigma)\circ\partial = \partial\circ\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma). \tag{4.3}$$

See Figure 2 for a visualization. The support of a geometric element $\pi_c\overline{P}$ gets inflated by $M_\sigma^{-1}$. Every inflated $(d-2)$-dimensional face $F$ of $\pi_c(\overline{\partial P})$ is replaced by $\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-2}(F)})$, which has the same endpoints of $\pi_c(\overline{\partial F})$. Notice that cancellation can happen since the matrix $M_{d-2}$ of $\mathbf{E}^{d-2}(\sigma)$ can have negative entries. By (4.3) the new boundary of the inflated support equals $\overline{\partial\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(P)}$, which means that the support obtained with the procedure described above can be subdivided in projected supports of elementary faces, and these are exactly those that we get applying $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ on $P$.




FIGURE 2. The inflated polygon $M_\sigma^{-5}\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 2})$ (black thick line) and $\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)^5(\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 2)})$ for the Hokkaido substitution $\sigma_0$ (see Section 6). The broken lines (blue lines) are obtained by applying $\mathbf{E}^1(\sigma_0)^5$ to the boundary of $(\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 2)$.

4.4. **Geometric finiteness property.** We do not know whether $\pi_c(\overline{\Gamma_\mathcal{U}})$ covers the entire representation space $\mathbb{K}_c$. This motivates the next important definition.

**Definition 4.11.** We say that $\sigma$ satisfies the *geometric finiteness property* for a geometric well-projecting $\mathcal{U} \in C_{d-1}$ if there exists an integer $m \geq 1$ such that $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^m(\mathcal{U})$ and $\pi_c(\overline{\Gamma_\mathcal{U}})$ is a covering of $\mathbb{K}_c$.

Geometric finiteness has been extensively studied in the irreducible case (see e.g. [ST09, BST10, MT14]). It is the geometrical interpretation of a certain finiteness property of Dumont-Thomas numeration systems, which was first introduced in the context of beta-numeration in [FS92].

The aim of this section is to obtain stepped surfaces for reducible Pisot substitutions. Now we have all the necessary ingredients.

**Theorem 1.** *Let $\sigma$ be a nice reducible substitution satisfying the geometric finiteness property for some $\mathcal{U}$. Then $\Gamma_\mathcal{U}$ is a stepped surface invariant under the substitution rule associated with a power of $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$. Furthermore $\pi(\Gamma_\mathcal{U})$ stays within bounded distance of $\mathbb{K}_c$.*

*Proof.* By the geometric finiteness property there exists an integer $m$ such that $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^m(\mathcal{U})$ and $\pi_c(\overline{\Gamma_\mathcal{U}})$ covers $\mathbb{K}_c$.

By Proposition 4.9, we can see $\pi_c(\overline{\Gamma_\mathcal{U}})$ made of successive inflations and subdivisions of $\pi_c(\overline{\mathcal{U}})$ under $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$. By Property (S1), for each face $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U)$ is geometric and projects well and by (S2) $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_1 + U_2)$ is geometric and projects well, for any two faces $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{U}$. Thus each $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^{km}(\mathcal{U})$ projects well onto $\mathbb{K}_c$ for every $k$, therefore $\pi_c(\overline{\Gamma_\mathcal{U}})$ is a polygonal tiling.

By definition $\Gamma_\mathcal{U}$ is invariant under $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^m$. Finally we have that $\pi(\overline{\Gamma_\mathcal{U}})$ stays within bounded distance of $\mathbb{K}_c$ since $\Gamma_\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{S}$. □

In the language of [Sol05, Fra08], $\pi_c(\overline{\Gamma_\mathcal{U}})$ forms a *pseudo self-affine tiling*, since the dual substitution $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ acts as an imperfect inflate-and-subdivide rule on $\mathbb{K}_c$.

The next property is crucial in other substitution frameworks; see e.g. [Fer06, ABFJ07, BF11].

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let $\sigma$ be a nice reducible substitution. Then the image by $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ of a stepped surface in $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{S}$ is a stepped surface $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)\Gamma \subset \mathcal{S}$.*

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of Property (S1) and (S2). Indeed, each face of the stepped surface is replaced after applying $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ by a geometric element

which projects well and any two distinct faces $U_1, U_2 \in \Gamma$ have disjoint images and $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(U_1 + U_2)$ projects well. □



FIGURE 3. $\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)^k(\mathcal{U})})$, $k = 0, 1, 2, 3, 7, 15$, for the 1-seed patch $\mathcal{U} = \{(\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 3), (\mathbf{0}, 1 \wedge 4), (\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 4), (\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 5), (\mathbf{0}, 3 \wedge 5)\}$.

## 5. RAUZY FRACTALS AND TILING RESULTS

In this section we define a new class of Rauzy fractals generated by the dual substitution $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$. We prove then that, under the geometrical finiteness property, they tile aperiodically and periodically their representation space $\mathbb{K}_c$.

### 5.1. **Rauzy fractals.**

**Proposition 5.1.** *For any $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) \in \mathcal{S}$, the sequence of sets $M_\sigma^k \, \pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})})$ converges in the Hausdorff metric.*

*Proof.* The Hausdorff distance $d_H(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}}), M_\sigma \, \pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})}))$ is uniformly bounded. The action of $M_\sigma$ on $\mathbb{K}_c$ is a contraction and we obtain that the Hausdorff distance between two successive sets in the sequence $(M_\sigma^k \, \pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})}))_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$

decreases geometrically fast. Hence the sequence $(M_\sigma^k\,\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})}))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a Cauchy sequence which converges to a unique compact set in the Hausdorff topology. □

**Definition 5.2.** The *Rauzy fractals* are defined as

$$\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})+\pi_c(\mathbf{x})=\lim_{k\to\infty} M_\sigma^k\,\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})}),\quad \text{for any } (\mathbf{x},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{S},$$

where the limit is taken with respect to the Hausdorff metric.

**Proposition 5.3.** *We have the set equations*

$$\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})+\pi_c(\mathbf{x})=\bigcup_{(\mathbf{y},\underline{b})\in\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})} M_\sigma\big(\mathcal{R}(\underline{b})+\pi_c(\mathbf{y})\big). \tag{5.1}$$

*Furthermore, if $\sigma$ is a nice reducible substitution then the union on the right-hand side is measure disjoint.*

*Proof.* The set equations follow easily by definition of Rauzy fractal. For the measures the following holds

$$\beta\;\lambda(\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}))\le\sum_{\underline{b}}|({}^tM_{d-1})_{\underline{a}\,\underline{b}}|\;\lambda(\mathcal{R}(\underline{b})).$$

We get the equality since by Lemma 4.6 the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of $|M_{d-1}|$ is $\beta$. □

It follows that the vector of measures $(\lambda(\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})))_{\underline{a}\in\mathcal{O}_{d-1}}$ is a non-zero Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of ${}^tM_{d-1}$.

Theorem 1 and the definition of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}$ imply that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}$ seen as set of colored points (the base points of the faces colored by their type) is a *substitution Delone set* (see [LW03]). Rauzy fractals are constructed starting from a substitution Delone set, as Proposition 5.3 shows. Thus, we can use the result [LW03, Theorem 5.5] (see also [EIR06, Theorem 6.1]) to deduce good properties for the Rauzy fractals.

**Proposition 5.4.** *If $\sigma$ is a nice reducible substitution then the Rauzy fractals have the following properties:*

*(1) they are compact sets with non-zero measure.*
*(2) they are the closure of their interior.*
*(3) their fractal boundary has zero measure.*

5.2. **Aperiodic and periodic tilings.** We introduce an important combinatorial condition on the substitution.

**Definition 5.5.** Given a well projecting geometric element $\mathcal{U}$, we say that the substitution $\sigma$ satisfies the *suffix $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition* if for every pair $(\mathbf{0},\underline{a}_0),(\mathbf{0},\underline{b}_0)\in\mathcal{U}$, there exist $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\underline{c}$ such that, for every $i=0,\dots,k-2$, $\sigma(\underline{a}_i)=\mathbf{p}_i\underline{a}_{i+1}\mathbf{s}_i$, $\sigma(\underline{b}_i)=\mathbf{p}'_i\underline{b}_{i+1}\mathbf{s}'_i$, and $\sigma(\underline{a}_{k-1})=\mathbf{p}_k\underline{c}\mathbf{s}_k$, $\sigma(\underline{b}_{k-1})=\mathbf{p}'_k\underline{c}\mathbf{s}'_k$, with $M_\sigma^{k-1}\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}_0)+\cdots+M_\sigma\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}_{k-1})+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}_k)=M_\sigma^{k-1}\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}'_0)+\cdots+M_\sigma\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}'_{k-1})+\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}'_k)$. We can equivalently define it in terms of prefixes.

*Remark* 5.6. Notice that in the irreducible case we can take the well-projecting geometric element $\mathcal{U}=\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}(\mathbf{0},a^*)$ and the $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition coincides with the *strong coincidence condition* defined in [AI01].

**Proposition 5.7.** *If $\sigma$ is a nice reducible substitution which satisfy the $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition for a well projecting geometric $\mathcal{U}$, then the subtiles $\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})$, $\underline{a} \in \mathcal{U}$, are pairwise measure disjoint.*

*Proof.* By the suffix $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition, for every $\underline{a}_0, \underline{b}_0 \in \mathcal{U}$ we have that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\underline{c}$ such that $M_\sigma^k \mathcal{R}(\underline{a}_0) + \pi_c(M_\sigma^{k-1}\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}_0) + \cdots + M_\sigma \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}_{k-1}) + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}_k))$ and $M_\sigma^k \mathcal{R}(\underline{b}_0) + \pi_c(M_\sigma^{k-1}\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}'_0) + \cdots + M_\sigma \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}'_{k-1}) + \mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}'_k))$ both appear in the $k$-fold iteration of the set equations of Proposition 5.3 for $\mathcal{R}(\underline{c})$, and furthermore are measure disjoint. □

In the following theorem we show that a nice reducible substitution with the geometric finiteness and strong coincidence conditions induces a fractal aperiodic tiling simply replacing the polygonal faces of a stepped surface with the Rauzy fractals.

**Theorem 2.** *Let $\sigma$ be a nice reducible substitution which satisfy the strong coincidence condition and the geometric finiteness property for the patch $\mathcal{U}$. Then the collection $\{\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x}) : (\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}\}$, where $\Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}$ is defined by (4.1), is a self-replicating tiling of $\mathbb{K}_c$.*

*Proof.* Start with the union of the $\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x})$ such that $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) \in \mathcal{U}$. By the $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition they are measure disjoint. By inflating each of them repeatedly by $M_\sigma^{-1}$ and applying the set equations (5.1) we get a measure-disjoint union of subtiles. The geometric finiteness property for $\mathcal{U}$ ensures that this process of inflation and subdivision on $\bigcup_{(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x})$ will cover all $\mathbb{K}_c$. It remains to prove the measure disjointness of any two $\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}_1) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x}_1) \subseteq M_\sigma^{-k}(\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x}))$, $\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}_2) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x}_2) \subseteq M_\sigma^{-k}(\mathcal{R}(\underline{b}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{y}))$ with $(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a})$, $(\mathbf{y}, \underline{b})$ different base points in $\mathcal{U}$. But this is true since $\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{R}(\underline{b}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{y})$ are measure disjoint by the $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition, and a posteriori the same holds for their inflations by $M_\sigma^{-k}$. □

One of the main novelties is that we obtain natural periodic tilings by our new Rauzy fractals starting from periodic polygonal tilings.

A *periodic element* is a geometric element $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}$ which, translated by a set of points $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}} \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a lattice, forms a stepped surface. In this case we will call the latter a *periodic stepped surface*. Examples of periodic stepped surfaces are:

(1) A single $(d-1)$-dimensional face $(\mathbf{0}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{d-1})$ together with $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}} = \mathbf{e}_{a_1}\mathbb{Z} + \cdots + \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}}\mathbb{Z}$.
(2) A *touching pair*, that is, two projecting well faces whose supports share a $(d-2)$-dimensional face: $(\mathbf{0}, b \wedge a_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{d-1})$, $(\mathbf{0}, c \wedge a_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{d-1})$, $b \neq c$. The associated set is $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}} = (\mathbf{e}_b - \mathbf{e}_c)\mathbb{Z} + \sum_{i=2}^{d-1} \mathbf{e}_{a_i}\mathbb{Z}$.
(3) A *d-touching* element, that is, $d = \deg(\beta)$ faces which are touching in pairs $\sum_{k=1}^{d}(\mathbf{0}, a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{a}_k \wedge \cdots \wedge a_d)$, where $\widehat{a}$ denotes that $a$ does not appear. The associated set is $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}} = \sum_{i=2}^{d}(\mathbf{e}_{a_1} - \mathbf{e}_{a_i})\mathbb{Z}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be $d$-touching and whose translations by $\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}}$ induce a polygonal periodic tiling. Let $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} := \bigcup_{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}(\underline{a})$ and $\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a}) := M_\sigma^k\, \pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{0}, \underline{a})})$.

**Proposition 5.8.** *Let $\sigma$ be a nice reducible substitution. For a periodic patch $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}$ we have that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a periodic covering of $\mathbb{K}_c$.*




FIGURE 4. A patch of the self-replicating tiling generated by $\mathcal{U}$ of Figure 3.

*Proof.* Since by Proposition 4.12 $\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)(\mathcal{P})}) + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is again a polygonal tiling, we have that

$$\lambda\big(M_\sigma^k\, \pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})}) \cap M_\sigma^k\, \pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{y},\underline{b})}\big) = 0$$

for any two faces $(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})$, $(\mathbf{y},\underline{b}) \in \mathcal{P} + \Lambda_{\mathcal{P}}$ and any positive integer $k$. Furthermore $\lambda(\pi_c(M_\sigma^k\, \overline{\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)^k(\mathbf{x},\underline{a})})) = \lambda(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{x},\underline{a}}))$, since $(\lambda(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0},\underline{a}})))_{\underline{a}\in\mathcal{O}_{d-1}}$ is a Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of $|{}^tM_{d-1}|$ associated with $\beta$. Thus $\bigcup_{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a periodic tiling, and since $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}$ is the Hausdorff limit of the approximations $\bigcup_{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$ it follows that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a covering. □

**Theorem 3.** *Let $\sigma$ be a nice reducible substitution. If the strong coincidence condition and the geometric finiteness property for the periodic element $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{S}$ hold, then $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a periodic tiling.*

*Proof.* If the geometric finiteness property for $\mathcal{P}$ holds then $\{\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x}) : (\mathbf{x},\underline{a}) \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}\}$ and $\pi_c(\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}})$ are tilings with the same translation set, where $\Gamma_{\mathcal{P}}$ is defined by (4.1). This implies that $\lambda(\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})) = \lambda(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0},\underline{a}}))$, for all $\underline{a}$, in particular for those appearing in the patch $\mathcal{P}$, and we know $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a covering by Proposition 5.8. Therefore $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a tiling. □

The following theorem asserts that we get a periodic tiling whenever the boundaries of the approximations converge to the boundary of the Rauzy fractal (cf. [IR06, Theorem 3.3] for the irreducible settings).

**Theorem 4.** *The collection $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{P}})$ is a periodic tiling of $\mathbb{K}_c$ if and only if $\lim_{k\to\infty} \partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a}) = \partial\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})$, $\forall\, \underline{a}$.*

*Proof.* Assume $\lim_{k\to\infty} \partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a}) = \partial\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})$. Then, since $\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a}) \to \mathcal{R}(\underline{a})$, we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $k = k(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$d_H(\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}), \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})) < \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad d_H(\partial\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}), \partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})) < \varepsilon.$$



FIGURE 5. A patch of the periodic tiling $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P} + \pi_c(\Lambda_\mathcal{P})$ induced by $\sigma_0$ of Section 6, for the 3-touching patch $\mathcal{P} = \{(\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 3), (\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 4), (\mathbf{0}, 3 \wedge 4)\}$ and $\Lambda_\mathcal{P} = (\mathbf{e}_4 - \mathbf{e}_2)\mathbb{Z} + (\mathbf{e}_4 - \mathbf{e}_3)\mathbb{Z}$.

By the former, for any $z \in \mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) \setminus \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$ there exists $z' \in B(z, \varepsilon) \cap \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$, which implies that the line segment from $z$ to $z'$ must intersect $\partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$. Hence there exists $z'' \in \partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$ such that $|z - z''| < \varepsilon$, and

$$\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a}) \cup [\partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})]_\varepsilon,$$

where $[X]_\varepsilon = \{x : |x - y| < \varepsilon \text{ for some } y \in X\}$. Since the approximations $\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$ have for every $k$ the same measure as the projected faces $\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}})$ and $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P} + \pi_c(\Lambda_\mathcal{P})$ is a covering we have $\lambda(\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P})/\lambda(\bigcup_{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})) \geq 1$. Thus we get equality if $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lambda([\partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})]_\varepsilon) = 0$. But the inequality $d_H(\partial\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}), \partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})) < \varepsilon$ implies that $[\partial\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})]_\varepsilon \subseteq [\partial\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})]_{2\varepsilon}$ and $\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \lambda([\partial\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})]_{2\varepsilon}) = 0$ since $\partial\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})$ has measure zero.

Suppose $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P} + \pi_c(\Lambda_\mathcal{P})$ is a tiling. Then $M_\sigma^{-k}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P}$ and $M_\sigma^{-k} \bigcup_{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$ tile both $\mathbb{K}_c$ modulo $M_\sigma^{-k}\pi_c(\Lambda_\mathcal{P})$. Let

$$C = \max_{\underline{a}}\{\operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}))\} + \max_{\underline{a}}\{\operatorname{diam}(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}}))\}.$$

If $B(z, R) \subset M_\sigma^{-k}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P}$ then $B(z, R - C) \subset M_\sigma^{-k} \bigcup_{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$, and $B(z, R) \subset M_\sigma^{-k} \bigcup_{(\mathbf{0},\underline{a})\in\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})$ implies $B(z, R - C) \subset M_\sigma^{-k}\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P}$. Hence

$$d_H(\partial(M_\sigma^{-k}\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})), \partial(M_\sigma^{-k}\mathcal{R}_k(\underline{a})) < 2C,$$

and the result follows. □

5.3. **Domain exchange.** Let $\mathcal{P}$ be $d$-touching with associated set $\Lambda_\mathcal{P}$ and let $\mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P}$ be the alphabet of the patch, consisting of the single letters appearing in the types of faces of $\mathcal{P}$. If the strong coincidence condition for $\mathcal{P}$ holds, then the components $\mathcal{R}(\underline{a})$ of $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P}$ are pairwise measure disjoint by Proposition 5.7. Therefore we can

define $\lambda$-a.e. the *domain exchange* on $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P}$ as

$$E_\mathcal{P} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_\ell), \quad \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}(\underline{a}), \tag{5.2}$$

for $\ell \in \mathcal{A}_\mathcal{P} \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}\}$, $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{d-1}$. Furthermore $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P} + \pi_c(\Lambda_\mathcal{P})$ is a periodic tiling and the natural projection of $E_\mathcal{P}$ on the $(d-1)$-dimensional torus $\mathbb{K}_c/\pi_c(\Lambda_\mathcal{P})$ is a translation.

We are interested now in codings of the domain exchange $E_\mathcal{P}$ with respect to the natural partition given by $\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P}$. We will investigate the symbolic dynamical systems $\Omega$ which codes the orbits of $(\mathcal{R}_\mathcal{P}, E_\mathcal{P})$ and establish connections with the original substitution dynamical system $(X_\sigma, S)$. This will be done in the next section for an infinite family of nice reducible Pisot substitutions.

## 6. Main example

We consider the family of reducible Pisot substitutions

$$\sigma_t : \ 1 \mapsto 1^{t+1}2, \ 2 \mapsto 3, \ 3 \mapsto 4, \ 4 \mapsto 1^t 5, \ 5 \mapsto 1, \quad t \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{6.1}$$

with associated polynomials

$$f(x)g(x) = (x^3 - tx^2 - (t+1)x - 1)(x^2 - x + 1).$$

Note that $\sigma_0$ is the substitution associated with the minimal Pisot number, known as *Hokkaido substitution*. The incidence matrices are

$$M_{\sigma_0} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_{\sigma_t} = \begin{pmatrix} t+1 & 0 & 0 & t & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since $\#\mathcal{A} = 5$ and $\deg(\beta) = 3$ we will consider the geometric dual substitution $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$ conjugate to $\mathbf{E}_3^*(\sigma_t)$. We have $\mathcal{O}_3 = \{1 \wedge 2 \wedge 3, \dots, 3 \wedge 4 \wedge 5\}$.

For $\sigma_t$ ($t \geq 0$), the dual maps are given explicitly by the following images of the basis $\{(\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}^*); \underline{a} \in \mathcal{O}_3\}$, written in the lexicographic order of $\mathcal{O}_3$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t) : (\mathbf{0}, 4\wedge 5) &\mapsto -\bigcup_{j=1}^{t}(M_{\sigma_t}^{-1}((t-j)\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbf{e}_5), 3\wedge 5) \ \cup\ (\mathbf{0}, 3\wedge 4)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 3\wedge 5) &\mapsto -\bigcup_{j=1}^{t}(M_{\sigma_t}^{-1}((t-j)\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbf{e}_5), 2\wedge 5) \ \cup\ (\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 4)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 3\wedge 4) &\mapsto (\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 3)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 5) &\mapsto \bigcup_{j=1}^{t+1}(M_{\sigma_t}^{-1}((t+1-j)\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbf{e}_2), 4\wedge 5)\\
&\qquad \cup\ -\bigcup_{j=1}^{t}(M_{\sigma_t}^{-1}((t-j)\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbf{e}_5), 1\wedge 5) \ \cup\ (\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 4)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 4) &\mapsto \bigcup_{j=1}^{t+1}(M_{\sigma_t}^{-1}((t+1-j)\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbf{e}_2), 3\wedge 5) \ \cup\ (\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 3)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 3) &\mapsto \bigcup_{j=1}^{t+1}(M_{\sigma_t}^{-1}((t+1-j)\mathbf{e}_1+\mathbf{e}_2)), 2\wedge 5) \ \cup\ (\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 2)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 5) &\mapsto -(\mathbf{0}, 4\wedge 5)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 4) &\mapsto -(\mathbf{0}, 3\wedge 5)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 3) &\mapsto -(\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 5)\\
(\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 2) &\mapsto -(\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 5)
\end{aligned}
$$

The associated matrices are

$$
M_2(\sigma_0) = \begin{pmatrix}
0&0&0&1&0&0&-1&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&0&1&0&0&-1&0&0\\
1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&-1&0\\
0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&-1\\
0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

and

$$
M_2(\sigma_t) = \begin{pmatrix}
0&0&0&t+1&0&0&-1&0&0&0\\
-t&0&0&0&t+1&0&0&-1&0&0\\
1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&-t&0&0&0&t+1&0&0&-1&0\\
0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&-t&0&0&0&0&0&-1\\
0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0&0\\
0&0&0&0&0&1&0&0&0&0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

One can check that, for all $t \geq 0$, $M_3(\sigma_t)^* = {}^tM_{\sigma_t} \wedge {}^tM_{\sigma_t} \wedge {}^tM_{\sigma_t} = |M_2(\sigma_t)|$ is a primitive matrix.

6.1. **Stepped surfaces.** We prove that our family of substitutions satisfies all hypotheses we need to generate stepped surfaces.

**Proposition 6.1.** *For each $t$, $\sigma_t$ is a nice reducible substitution.*

*Proof.* For each $\sigma_t$ the polynomial $g(x) = x^2 - x + 1$, thus (N) is true. We have that $\mathbf{E}_3^*(\sigma)$ is positive and $M_3^* = \wedge^3({}^tM_\sigma)$ is primitive.

For (S1) we can look at the definition of $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$ and check that the images of each face are geometric and project well. For (S2) we must check that for every pairs of possible neighboring faces $U_1, U_2$ then $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)(U_1 + U_2)$ is geometric and projecting well. This can be readily done for two neighboring faces centered at $\mathbf{0}$ using again the definition of $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$. On the other hand there could be faces $U_1, U_2$ such that their supports intersect in only one point or whose supports are disjoint but with $\overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)(U_1)} \cap \overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)(U_2)} \neq \emptyset$. For this reason, we must check this disjointness condition for all pair of faces near to $\mathbb{K}_c$, i.e. in $\mathcal{S}$, inside the ball $B(\mathbf{0}, R)$ where

$$R = \frac{2 \max_{\mathbf{s}:\sigma(\underline{a})=\mathbf{p}\underline{b}\mathbf{s}}\{\pi_c(\mathbf{l}(\mathbf{s}))\}}{1 - \|\beta\|_c}$$

where $\|\beta\|_c = \max\{|\beta'| : \beta' \text{ Galois conjugate of } \beta\}$. Indeed, two faces whose base points are at a distance greater than $R$ will have necessarily images with disjoints supports. Furthermore, $B(\mathbf{0}, R) \cap \pi_c\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is finite since $\pi_c\overline{\mathcal{S}}$ is a Delone set. Thus we have to check only finitely many possibilities. One can check by computation that, for each $\sigma_t$, $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)(U_1 + U_2)$ is geometric and projects well for any two geometric and projecting well $U_1, U_2$. □

Now we prove that our family satisfies the geometric finiteness property for certain geometric elements. In this way we are able to generate stepped surfaces and have aperiodic and periodic tilings by Rauzy fractals.

We use some notions of [BBJS16, Section 3.3]. A geometric element is said to be *edge-connected* if the supports of any two of its faces are connected by a path of supports of faces $\overline{F_1}, \ldots, \overline{F_m}$ such that $\overline{F_k}$, $\overline{F_{k+1}}$ share an edge, for all $k \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$. We say that an edge-connected geometric element $A$ *surrounds* an edge-connected geometric element $P$ if $P \subset A$ and $\overline{\partial P} \cap \overline{\partial A} = \emptyset$. If being surrounded is preserved under iterations of the dual substitution $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$, then we say that the dual substitution satisfies the *annulus property*.

**Proposition 6.2.** *The following holds for our family of substitutions:*

1. *For every patch $\mathcal{U}$ we have $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)^5(\mathcal{U})$.*
2. *Let $\mathcal{U}_0$ be a 3-touching patch. Then for each $i \geq 0$ we have that $\overline{\mathcal{U}_{i+1}} := \overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)^{15}(\mathcal{U}_i)}$ surrounds $\overline{\mathcal{U}_i}$. Therefore $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$ satisfies the annulus property and the geometric finiteness property for $\mathcal{U}_0$ holds.*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove the statements for $\sigma_0$ since the support of $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)$ is contained in that of $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$, for $t \geq 1$, as it can be readily seen in the definition of $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$.

(1) By computation one can see that each face occurs with no additional translation in its image by $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)^5$.

(2) Again by computation we can check that the basic step of the induction is verified since $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)^{15}(\mathcal{U}_0)$ surrounds $\mathcal{U}_0$, for every 3-touching patch $\mathcal{U}_0$ (an example of this computation can be seen in Figure 6). Furthermore the image af two edge-connected faces is edge-connected.

It remains to show that if $\mathcal{U}_i$ surrounds $\mathcal{U}_{i-1}$ then $\mathcal{U}_{i+1}$ surrounds $\mathcal{U}_i$. Suppose that $\mathcal{U}_i$ surrounds $\mathcal{U}_{i-1}$ "enough", meaning that the shortest distance between $\partial\mathcal{U}_i$ and $\partial\mathcal{U}_{i-1}$ is large enough. Then, since $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)$ acts as an imperfect inflate-and-subdivide rule on $\mathbb{K}_c$ with inflation $M_\sigma^{-1}|_{\mathbb{K}_c}$, the shape of $\overline{\mathcal{U}_{i+1}} = \overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)^{15}(\mathcal{U}_i)}$ will be very close to that of $\overline{\mathcal{U}_i} = \overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)^{15}(\mathcal{U}_{i-1})}$ inflated by $M_\sigma^{-1}|_{\mathbb{K}_c}$. Hence the

shortest distance between $\partial\mathcal{U}_{i+1}$ and $\partial\mathcal{U}_i$ will be bigger than that one between $\overline{\partial\mathcal{U}_i}$ and $\overline{\partial\mathcal{U}_{i-1}}$, which implies that $\overline{\mathcal{U}_{i+1}}$ surrounds $\overline{\mathcal{U}_i}$ (see Figure 7 on the left for a visualization). □



FIGURE 6. $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)^{15}(\mathcal{U}_0)$ surrounds $\mathcal{U}_0 = \{(\mathbf{0}, 3 \wedge 4), (\mathbf{0}, 3 \wedge 5), (\mathbf{0}, 4 \wedge 5)\}$

Notice that there exist elements which are not 3-touching but for which the geometric finiteness property nevertheless holds. The patch of Figure 3 is an example. On the other hand, the geometric finiteness property does not hold for any single face $(\mathbf{0}, \underline{a})$ (see Figure 7 on the right for an example).

We have an algorithm which ends if and only if a coincidence is found for a pair of elements in a 3-touching $\mathcal{U}$. But we cannot prove in general that every $\sigma_t$ satisfies the suffix (or prefix) $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition for each 3-touching $\mathcal{U}$, since the complexity of computations grows very fast.

**Corollary 6.3.** *Let $\sigma_t$ be a substitution of the family* (6.1)*. For every* 3*-touching $\mathcal{U}$ for which the $\mathcal{U}$-strong coincidence condition holds, the collection* $\{\mathcal{R}(\underline{a}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{x}) :$



FIGURE 7. $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)^{10k}((\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge4)+(\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge5)+(\mathbf{0}, 4\wedge5))$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, 3$ (left) and $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_1)^{10}(\mathbf{0}, 2 \wedge 4)$ (right).



FIGURE 8. Domain exchange for $\mathcal{R}(2 \wedge 3)$, $\mathcal{R}(2 \wedge 4)$, $\mathcal{R}(3 \wedge 4)$, and original Hokkaido tile $-\mathcal{R}$.

$(\mathbf{x}, \underline{a}) \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}\}$ *is a self-replicating tiling of* $\mathbb{K}_c \cong \mathbb{C}$. *Furthermore* $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{U}} + \pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{U}})$ *is a periodic tiling of* $\mathbb{K}_c$ *and the domain exchange* $E_{\mathcal{U}}$ *projects to a translation on the torus* $\mathbb{C}/\pi_c(\Lambda_{\mathcal{U}}) \cong \mathbb{T}^2$.

*Proof.* Direct consequence of Theorem 2 and 3, since we showed in Proposition 6.1 that each substitution $\sigma_t$ is a nice reducible substitution and in Proposition 6.2 that satisfies the geometric finiteness property for every 3-touching $\mathcal{U}$. □

6.2. **Relations with numeration.** The aim of this section is to find a way to decompose our new Rauzy fractals $\mathcal{R}(a \wedge b)$ in original Dumont-Thomas subtiles $\mathcal{R}(c)$ (see (2.3)).

We can use numeration to describe the subtiles $\mathcal{R}(a \wedge b)$ using the $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)$-*suffix graph* that is defined as follows. The vertices of the graph are the $\underline{a}^*$, and there is an edge $\underline{a}^* \xrightarrow{s} \underline{b}^*$ if and only if $(M_\sigma^{-1}\mathbf{l}(s), \underline{a}^*) \in \mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)(\mathbf{0}, \underline{b}^*)$.

In Figure 9 the $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$-suffix graph is depicted. Observe that this graph with reversed edges describes the images of every face by $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$.

**Proposition 6.4.** *We have*

$$\mathcal{R}(a \wedge b) = \left\{ \sum_{i \geq 0} \pi_c(M_\sigma^i \mathbf{e}_{s_i}) : (s_i)_{i \geq 0} \in \mathcal{G}_s(a \wedge b) \right\}$$

*where* $\mathcal{G}_s(a \wedge b)$ *denotes the set of labels of left-infinite walks in the* $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)$-*suffix graph ending at state* $a \wedge b$.

*Proof.* Direct consequence of Proposition 5.3 and of the definition of $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)$. □

By abuse of notation we will write 0 instead of $\epsilon$ by reading labels of walks in the suffix or $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_0)$-suffix graphs. We will relate the elements $\sum_{i \geq 0} \pi_c(M_\sigma^i \mathbf{l}(s_i))$ with $(s_i)_{i \geq 0} \in \mathcal{G}_s(a \wedge b)$ with those $\sum_{i \geq 0} \pi_c(M_\sigma^i \mathbf{l}(s_i))$ for $(s_i)_{i \geq 0} \in \mathcal{G}_s(a)$.

We work with the Hokkaido substitution $\sigma_0$ for which we have

$$\mathcal{G}_s(a) = \{(s_i)_{i \geq 0} = \cdots 0^5 2^{k_2} 0^5 2^{k_1} 0^{a-1} : 0 \leq k_i \leq \infty\}.$$

Notice that we have $\pi_e(\mathbf{e}_1) = \pi_e(\mathbf{e}_3) + \pi_e(\mathbf{e}_4)$ and $\pi_e(\mathbf{e}_5) = \pi_e(\mathbf{e}_2) + \pi_e(\mathbf{e}_3)$.




FIGURE 9. The $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_t)$-suffix graph. Every unlabelled edge has the empty suffix as label, while the edges labelled by $5, \dots, 1^{t-1}5$ exist only for $t \geq 1$.

**Lemma 6.5.** *We have*

$$\mathcal{R}(2 \wedge 3) = (-\mathcal{R}(1) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_1)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(4) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4)),$$
$$\mathcal{R}(2 \wedge 4) = (-\mathcal{R}(1) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(3) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(5) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)),$$
$$\mathcal{R}(3 \wedge 4) = (-\mathcal{R}(2) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(5) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_5)).$$

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\pi_e(M_\sigma^3 \mathbf{e}_2) = \pi_e(M_\sigma \mathbf{e}_2) + \pi_e(\mathbf{e}_2) \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \delta(2000.) = \delta(0022.). \tag{6.2}$$

where $\delta(w) = \sum_{i=0}^{|w|} \pi_e(M_\sigma^i \mathbf{l}(w_i))$. Notice that we can extend $\delta$ to infinite strings $(s_i)_{i \geq 0}$. We will prove using (6.2) that $\delta(\mathcal{G}_s(2 \wedge 3)) = \delta(\mathcal{G}_s(1) \cup \mathcal{G}_s(4))$. For this reason we will write $w =_\delta w'$ if $\delta(w) = \delta(w')$. The cycle

$$2 \wedge 3 \xrightarrow{002} 2 \wedge 5 \xrightarrow{00} 2 \wedge 4 \xrightarrow{0} 3 \wedge 5 \xrightarrow{00} 2 \wedge 5 \xrightarrow{2} 2 \wedge 3, \qquad 3 \wedge 5 \circlearrowright^{(20)^k}$$

in the graph of Figure 9 produces strings of type $0020^3(20)^k002 =_\delta 0^5 2^{2k+2}$. Starting from state $2 \wedge 5$ we get strings $0^5 2^{2k+1}$. Walking from the first node $2 \wedge 5$ to the second $2 \wedge 5$ returns $0^5 2^{2k}$ and extending this walk to the left starting from $2 \wedge 3$ we obtain $0^5 2^{2k+3}$. Walking in Figure 9 from $2 \wedge 3$ to $2 \wedge 5$ we get the word $0022002 =_\delta 20^5 2$. Thus, $\delta(\mathcal{G}_s(2 \wedge 3)) = \delta(\cdots 0^5 2^{k_2} 0^5 2^{k_1})$, with $0 \leq k_i \leq \infty$, i.e. $\delta(\mathcal{G}_s(1))$. Strings ending with $0^3$ are obtained following the loop $2 \wedge 3 \xrightarrow{00} 4 \wedge 5 \xrightarrow{2} 2 \wedge 5 \xrightarrow{2} 2 \wedge 3$. Since these are all possible paths ending at $2 \wedge 3$ we have proven that $\delta(\mathcal{G}_s(2 \wedge 3)) = \delta(\mathcal{G}_s(1) \cup \mathcal{G}_s(4))$ which implies $\mathcal{R}(2 \wedge 3) = (-\mathcal{R}(1) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_1)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(4) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4))$ by (2.4).

Since $2 \wedge 3$ goes to $3 \wedge 4$ by reading a 0 we deduce immediately that all the strings ending at $3 \wedge 4$ are equivalent under $\delta$ to those in $\mathcal{G}_s(2) \cup \mathcal{G}_s(5)$. Hence by (2.4) we get $\mathcal{R}(3 \wedge 4) = (-\mathcal{R}(2) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(5) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_5))$.

Starting from $2 \wedge 5$ and going to $2 \wedge 4$ passing by $1 \wedge 3$ we read 00 and by the above reasonings we get then all possible strings $\cdots 2^{k_2} 0^5 2^{k_1} 00$ belonging to $\mathcal{G}_s(3)$. From $2 \wedge 5 \xrightarrow{00} 2 \wedge 4 \xrightarrow{0} 3 \wedge 5 \xrightarrow{2} 2 \wedge 4$ we get all expansions in $\mathcal{G}_s(5) + 2$, where with the latter we mean the set of $(s_i)_{i \geq 0} \in \mathcal{G}_s(5)$ such that $s_0 = 2$. Walking $k$ times through the loop $2 \wedge 4 \to 3 \wedge 5 \to 2 \wedge 4$ and extending to the left with $2 \wedge 5$ we get strings $0^2(02)^k$.

Subtracting $v_4 = \delta(200.)$ we get $0^2(02)^{k-2}0002 =_\delta 0^5 2^{2k-3}$. Walking through the loop $2\wedge 4 \to 3\wedge 5 \to 2\wedge 5 \to 2\wedge 4$ and then once into $2\wedge 4 \to 3\wedge 5 \to 2\wedge 4$ we read the string $020^5 =_\delta 0^4 2^3$ and, after subtracting $v_4$, we get $0^5 2^2$. Repeating this loop we get arbitrary large strings ending with an even number of 2s. Thus we have shown we get strings in $\mathcal{G}_s(1)+4$.

So by (2.4) we just proved that $\mathcal{R}(2\wedge 4)$ is made of the domains $\delta(\mathcal{G}_s(3)) = -\mathcal{R}(3) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)$, $\delta(\mathcal{G}_s(5)+2) = -\mathcal{R}(5) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_5) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2) = -\mathcal{R}(5) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)$ and $\delta(\mathcal{G}_s(1)+4) = -\mathcal{R}(1) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_1) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4) = -\mathcal{R}(1) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)$, since $\pi_c(\mathbf{e}_1) = \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4)$ and $\pi_c(\mathbf{e}_5) = \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)$. □

We can carry on the computations for the other $\mathcal{R}(a\wedge b)$ in a similar way as above. We obtain

$$\mathcal{R}(2\wedge 5) = (-\mathcal{R}(1) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_1)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(4) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2)),$$
$$\mathcal{R}(3\wedge 5) = (-\mathcal{R}(5) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_5)) \cup (-\mathcal{R}(1) - \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4)),$$

and for the others just use the set equation $\mathcal{R}(a\wedge b) = M_\sigma \mathcal{R}(a'\wedge b')$ for $a\wedge b \leftarrow a'\wedge b'$.

Similar formulas to express the Rauzy fractals in terms of the subtiles $\mathcal{R}(a)$ hold for the entire family of substitutions $\sigma_t$.

6.3. **The combinatorial method.** We describe an interesting interpretation in terms of broken lines. Being reducible for a substitution means that we have some linear dependencies between the $\pi(\mathbf{e}_i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. For each $\sigma_t$ we have

$$\pi(\mathbf{e}_1) = \pi(\mathbf{e}_3) + \pi(\mathbf{e}_4), \qquad \pi(\mathbf{e}_5) = \pi(\mathbf{e}_2) + \pi(\mathbf{e}_3). \tag{6.3}$$

We work again with $\sigma_0$. We have a *broken line* in $\mathbb{R}^5$ which is the geometrical interpretation of a periodic point $u$ of $\sigma$:

$$\overline{u} = \bigcup_{i\geq 1} \{(\mathbf{l}(u_{[0,i)}), u_i)\},$$

where $u_{[0,i)} = u_0 \cdots u_{i-1}$ and $(\mathbf{x}, i)$ denotes the segment from $\mathbf{x}$ to $\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{e}_i$. Projecting the broken line into $\mathbb{K}_\beta \cong \mathbb{R}^3$ the rational dependencies show up, and we get what we call a "reducible" broken line, made of five different segments. We can change this broken line using the rational dependencies, i.e. we substitute every $\pi(\mathbf{e}_1)$ and $\pi(\mathbf{e}_5)$ with their linearly independent atoms $\pi(\mathbf{e}_2)$, $\pi(\mathbf{e}_3)$ and $\pi(\mathbf{e}_4)$ as in the relations (6.3). Combinatorially this is equivalent to applying the morphism

$$\chi:\ 1 \mapsto 34, \quad 2 \mapsto 2, \quad 3 \mapsto 3, \quad 4 \mapsto 4, \quad 5 \mapsto 32, \tag{6.4}$$

to the fixed point of $\sigma$. Operating in this way we get more vertices in the new broken line, included the old ones. View as a tiling of the line, we get a decomposition of the tiling of the line using only the rationally independent lengths $v_2$, $v_3$ and $v_4$. So we may say that in this process we converted the broken line into an irreducible one.




FIGURE 10. Effect of the morphism $\chi$ on the tiling of the line determined by the fixed point of $\sigma_0$.

Let $w = \chi(u)$ and consider the *refinements*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,\ell)}) := \overline{\{\pi_c(\mathbf{l}(w_{[0,N)}) : N \in \mathbb{N}, w_{[N,N+\ell)} = a_{[0,\ell)}\}}, \tag{6.5}$$

for $a_{[0,\ell)} \in \{2,3,4\}^*$. Using the definition (2.2) of the subtiles $\mathcal{R}(a)$ as projections of colored vertices of the broken line and considering the refinements $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a) = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,1)})$, we see from the morphism $\chi$ that

$$\mathcal{R}(1) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(3),\ \mathcal{R}(1) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(4), \quad \mathcal{R}(5) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(3),\ \mathcal{R}(5) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(2)$$

and of course $\mathcal{R}(2) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(2)$, $\mathcal{R}(3) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(3)$, $\mathcal{R}(4) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(4)$. Therefore, in view of Lemma 6.5, we can deduce the following.

**Proposition 6.6.** *We have*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_a) = -\mathcal{R}(b \wedge c), \quad \textit{for} \quad \{b,c\} = \{2,3,4\} \setminus \{a\}.$$

Since the strong coincidence condition holds for $\mathcal{U} = (\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 3) + (\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 4) + (\mathbf{0}, 3\wedge 4)$, we can define the domain exchange on $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = \bigcup_{a\in\{2,3,4\}} \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a)$ by

$$\widetilde{E} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{x} + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_a), \quad \text{if } \mathbf{x} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a).$$

Then $(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}, \widetilde{E}) = (-\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}, E_{\mathcal{P}}^{-1})$.



FIGURE 11. The domain exchanges $E$ on $\mathcal{R}$ and $\widetilde{E}$ on $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$.

This is in fact not surprising since we considered suffixes in the definition of $\mathbf{E}^{d-1}(\sigma)$ and we constructed the $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a)$ as projection of vertices of the broken line,

i.e. considering prefixes. In fact these two constructions are equivalent up to isometry, as it is explained also in [CS01, Section 5].

Combinatorially the morphism $\chi$ describes the first return of $\widetilde{E}$ on $\mathcal{R}$. Indeed from the decomposition of Lemma 6.5 and Proposition 6.6 one can see in Figure 11 for example that $\mathcal{R}(1) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(3)$ before returning to $\mathcal{R}$ under $\widetilde{E}$ passes through $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(4)$.

**Proposition 6.7.** *$E$ is the first return of $\widetilde{E}$ on $\mathcal{R}$.*

*Proof.* From the decomposition of Lemma 6.5 and Proposition 6.6 we see that $\widetilde{E}(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(4)) = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(4) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4) = (\mathcal{R}(1) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3 + \mathbf{e}_4)) \cup (\mathcal{R}(4) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4))$ and $\widetilde{E}(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(2)) = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(2) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2) = (\mathcal{R}(2) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2)) \cup (\mathcal{R}(5) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3 + \mathbf{e}_2))$. Furthermore $\mathcal{R}(1)$, $\mathcal{R}(3)$ and $\mathcal{R}(5)$ are in $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(3)$ and applying $\widetilde{E}$ we translate them by $\pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3)$. Using the relations $\pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_4) = \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_1)$ and $\pi_c(\mathbf{e}_2) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_3) = \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_5)$ we get $\widetilde{E}|_{\mathcal{R}} = E$. □

*Remark* 6.8. Note that there are other three morphisms other than $\chi$ obtained by flipping the image of 1 or 5. The effect of these morphisms on the fixed point of $\sigma_0$ change the subtiles and the domain exchanges.

6.4. **Symbolic dynamics.** Given a fixed point $u$ of $\sigma$ let $\Omega = \overline{\{S^k\chi(u) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}}$.

**Lemma 6.9.** *$(\Omega, S)$ is minimal and uniquely ergodic.*

*Proof.* We know that $(X_\sigma, S)$, where $X_\sigma = \overline{\{S^k u : k \in \mathbb{N}\}}$, is minimal. This means that every factor of $u$ occurs in $u$ with bounded gaps, and the same happens for $\chi(u)$. Thus $(\Omega, S)$ is minimal.

By primitivity of $\sigma$ the system $(X_\sigma, S, \mu)$ is uniquely ergodic, so the cone

$$\bigcap_{n\geq 0} M_\sigma^n \mathbb{R}_+^5 = \mathbb{R}_+ \mathbf{u}_\beta$$

is one-dimensional and is parametrized by the right eigenvector $\mathbf{u}_\beta$ (rescaled such that $\|\mathbf{u}_\beta\|_1 = 1$) which coincides with the vector of letter frequencies $(\mu([1]), \dots, \mu([5]))$. For the system $(\Omega, S)$, with $\Omega = \overline{\{S^k\chi(u) : k \in \mathbb{N}\}}$, the cone

$$M_\chi \bigcap_{n\geq 0} M_\sigma^n \mathbb{R}_+^5$$

is also one-dimensional, with $M_\chi$ incidence matrix of $\chi$. Hence $\Omega$ has uniform factor frequencies by [BD14, Theorem 5.7], which is equivalent to unique ergodicity by [Que10, Corollary 4.2]. □

We want to show that the dynamical system $(\Omega, S, m)$, where $m$ is the unique $S$-invariant Borel probability measure on $\Omega$, is measurably conjugate to $(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}, \widetilde{E}, \lambda)$. Following [BST14], we define the *representation map*

$$\phi : \Omega \to \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}, \quad (a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \mapsto \bigcap_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,\ell)}). \tag{6.6}$$

**Lemma 6.10.** *$\phi$ is well-defined, continuous and surjective.*

*Proof.* Let $(a_i)_{i\in\mathbb{N}} \in \Omega$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,0)}) \supset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,1)}) \supset \cdots$, and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,\ell)}) \neq \emptyset$ for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. The word $w = \chi(u)$ is uniformly recurrent, since $u$ is generated by a primitive substitution and $\chi$ does not affect the uniformly recurrence. Thus we have a sequence $(\ell_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $a_{[\ell_k,\ell_k+k)} = w_{[0,k)}$, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,\ell_k+k)}) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[\ell_k,\ell_k+k)}) - \pi_c(\mathbf{l}(a_{[0,\ell_k)}))$, we need to show that the diameter of

$\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[\ell_k,\ell_k+k)}) = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(w_{[0,k)})$ converges to zero. Let $\mathcal{S}_k = \{\pi_c(\mathbf{l}(w_{[0,j)}) : 0 \le j \le k\}$. Then $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(w_{[0,k)}) + \mathcal{S}_k \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathcal{S}_k = \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ with respect to the Hausdorff metric. But this implies that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(w_{[0,k)}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$, which proves that $\phi$ is well-defined.

The map $\phi$ is continuous since the sequence $(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,\ell)}))_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}}$ is nested and converges to a single point. The surjectivity follows from a Cantor diagonal argument. □

**Lemma 6.11.** *$(\Omega, S, m)$ is measurably conjugate to $(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}, \widetilde{E}, \lambda)$ via $\phi$.*

*Proof.* The collections $\mathcal{K}_i = \{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,i)}) : a_{[0,i)} \in L_i(w)\}$, where $L_i(w)$ is the set factors of length $i$ of $w$, are measure-theoretic partitions of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,i)}) = \bigcap_{j=0}^{i-1} \widetilde{E}^{-j}\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_j)$. Hence $\phi(w') \neq \phi(w'')$ for all $w', w'' \in \phi^{-1}(\widetilde{\mathcal{R}} \setminus \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}, K\in\mathcal{K}_i} \partial K)$ with $w' \neq w''$, and $m(\phi^{-1}(\bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}, K\in\mathcal{K}_i} \partial K)) = 0$ since we have $\lambda(\partial K) = 0$ for all $K \in \mathcal{K}_i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, by Proposition 5.4, and $\lambda \circ \phi$ is an $S$-invariant Borel measure, which equals $m$ by unique ergodicity of $(\Omega, S)$. Thus the map $\phi$ is injective almost everywhere. Finally $\phi((a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}})$ is a single point $\mathbf{z} = \bigcap_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,\ell)})$. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[0,\ell+1)}) + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_0}) \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[1,\ell+1)})$, for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain that $\widetilde{E}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{z} + \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_0}) = \bigcap_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} \widetilde{\mathcal{R}}(a_{[1,\ell)})$, but this is the same as shifting $(a_k)_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ and applying $\phi$. Thus we checked that $\widetilde{E} \circ \phi = \phi \circ S$. □

**Theorem 5.** *For each substitution $\sigma$ of the family* (6.1) *we have the following commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} X_\sigma & \xrightarrow{\chi} & \Omega & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \widetilde{\mathcal{R}} & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \mathbb{C}/\Lambda \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle S} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle S} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{E}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \widetilde{E}} \\ X_\sigma & \xrightarrow{\chi} & \Omega & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \widetilde{\mathcal{R}} & \xrightarrow{\pi_0} & \mathbb{C}/\Lambda \end{array}$$

*The maps $\phi$ and $\pi_0$ are measure-theoretical isomorphisms while $\chi$ is the morphism* (6.4)*. Thus $(X_\sigma, S, \mu)$ is a first return of a toral translation.*

*Proof.* Notice that the relations (6.3) hold for the whole family of $\sigma_t$. The interpretation with broken lines (6.5) and the results of Proposition 6.6, 6.7 and Lemma 6.11 can be generalized for the entire family of substitutions $\sigma_t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. □

## 7. Perspectives

Future works will tackle the following problems.

7.1. **Non-projecting-well substitutions and neutral space.** Consider the family of substitutions

$$\sigma_t : 1 \mapsto 1^{t-1}2,\ 2 \mapsto 1^{t-1}3,\ 3 \mapsto 4,\ 4 \mapsto 1, \quad (t \ge 2)$$

with characteristic polynomial $f(x)g(x) = (x^3 - tx^2 + x - 1)(x + 1)$. The rational dependency relation is $\pi(\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_3) = \pi(\mathbf{e}_2 + \mathbf{e}_4)$. Since $n = 4$ and $d = 3$, we deal with $\mathbf{E}_2^*(\sigma)$ and its geometric realization $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)$.

We observe from Figure 12 that the substitution $\sigma_2$ does not project well. Overlaps of this type can be observed for the whole family. See also [Fur06] for some similar polygonal overlaps obtained in the framework of non-Pisot unimodular matrices.

This problem could be solved by considering a different projection onto $\mathbb{K}_c$, or by the "retiling" method introduced in [FIR06]. This involves an accurate study of




FIGURE 12. $\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma)(\mathbf{0}, 2\wedge 4)}) = \pi_c\overline{(\mathbf{0}, 1\wedge 3)} \cup \pi_c\overline{(\mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_4, 3\wedge 4)}$ for $\sigma_2$ (left) and $\mathbf{E}^2(\sigma_1)$-iterate of a geometric element and its projection onto $\mathbb{K}_c$ (right).

positivity and cancellation, together with manipulations, such as flips, on stepped surfaces, in the spirit of [ABFJ07, BF11].

The main question is whether we can generalize the constructions of this paper to any reducible Pisot substitution, improving the characterization of the stepped surfaces understanding what happens with respect to the neutral space. Some interesting studies on the role of the neutral space in the geometry and dynamics of reducible substitutions have been initiated in [ABB11].

7.2. **Connections with irreducible substitutions.** Figure 13 suggests that we can change projection and view stepped surfaces considering a smaller number of faces. The study of the new combinatorial approach based on morphisms and modified broken lines of Section 6.3 deserves more investigations. It is curious to observe that, using the morphisms $\chi$ defined in (6.4) and $\bar{\chi}$ obtained from $\chi$ by flipping the image of 1, we get a connection between the Hokkaido substitution $\sigma : 1 \mapsto 21, 2 \mapsto 3, 3 \mapsto 4, 4 \mapsto 5, 5 \mapsto 1$ and the irreducible substitution $\sigma_{\text{irr}} : 2 \mapsto 3, 3 \mapsto 4, 4 \mapsto 23$, having same Pisot polynomial:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \{1,\dots,5\}^* & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \{1,\dots,5\}^* \\ \bar{\chi}\downarrow & & \downarrow\chi \\ \{2,3,4\}^* & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{\text{irr}}} & \{2,3,4\}^* \end{array}$$

Can we in general connect the study of the dynamics of a reducible substitution to that of an irreducible one?

We saw in Theorem 5 that for a family of reducible Pisot substitutions $(X_\sigma, S)$ is the first return of a toral translation. Induced dynamics can have different behavior, thus it is natural to ask in which cases these first returns have pure discrete spectrum (see [Rau84] for connections with *bounded remainder sets*).



FIGURE 13. It is interesting to notice that changing suitably the projection we get different polygonal tilings by some faces of three different types.

7.3. **Contact graphs.** Further research is motivated by the fact that the existence of polygonal approximations for the Rauzy fractals allows to define contact graphs (see [Thu06, ST09]) even in the reducible case for the study of the fractal boundaries.

## APPENDIX A. PROOF OF LEMMA 4.7

**Lemma A.1.** *Let $n = p + m$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ and $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}_{i=1,\dots,n}$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, let $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_m \in \mathcal{O}_m$ and $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\det(M\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, M\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots \mathbf{e}_{a_m})\\ &= \sum_{\underline{b}=b_1\wedge\cdots\wedge b_m\in\mathcal{O}_m} \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{p} M_\sigma\right)_{\underline{a}^*,\underline{b}^*} (-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}} \det(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{e}_{b_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{b_m}).\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* We write $\mathbf{x}_k = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbf{x}_k^{(j)} \mathbf{e}_j$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $M = (m_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n}$ and compute the determinant:

$$\begin{aligned}&\det(M\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, M\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots \mathbf{e}_{a_m})\\ &= \det\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n}\sum_{j_1=1}^{n} m_{i_1j_1}\mathbf{x}_1^{(j_1)}\mathbf{e}_{i_1}, \dots, \sum_{i_p=1}^{n}\sum_{j_p=1}^{n} m_{i_pj_p}\mathbf{x}_p^{(j_p)}\mathbf{e}_{i_p}, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots \mathbf{e}_{a_m}\right)\\ &= \sum_{1\le j_1,\dots,j_p\le n} \mathbf{x}_1^{(j_1)} \cdots \mathbf{x}_p^{(j_p)} \det\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} m_{i_1j_1}\mathbf{e}_{i_1}, \dots, \sum_{i_p=1}^{n} m_{i_pj_p}\mathbf{e}_{i_p}, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots \mathbf{e}_{a_m}\right)\\ &= \sum_{\substack{1\le j_1,\dots,j_p\le n,\\ \#\{j_1,\dots,j_p\}=p}} \mathbf{x}_1^{(j_1)} \cdots \mathbf{x}_p^{(j_p)} \det\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} m_{i_1j_1}\mathbf{e}_{i_1}, \dots, \sum_{i_p=1}^{n} m_{i_pj_p}\mathbf{e}_{i_p}, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots \mathbf{e}_{a_m}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Remember that $(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{p} M)_{\underline{a}^*,\underline{b}^*}$ is the $p \times p$ minor of $M$ obtained by deleting the rows $a_1, \dots, a_m$ and the columns $b_1, \dots, b_m$ of $M$, where $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_m$ and

$\underline{b} = b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_m$. Therefore, by definition,

$$\det\left(\sum_{i_1=1}^{n} m_{i_1 j_1}\mathbf{e}_{i_1}, \ldots, \sum_{i_p=1}^{n} m_{i_p j_p}\mathbf{e}_{i_p}, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \ldots \mathbf{e}_{a_m}\right) = (-1)^{\underline{a}+((p+1)+\cdots+n)} \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{p} M\right)_{\underline{a}^*,\underline{j}'^*} \operatorname{sgn}(\tau).$$

Here, $\underline{j}' = j'_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge j'_m \in \mathcal{O}_m$ such that $\{j_1, \ldots, j_p\} \cup \{j'_1, \ldots, j'_m\} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\tau$ is the permutation of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ satisfying $\tau(j'_1) = j'_1, \ldots, \tau(j'_m) = j'_m$ and $\tau(j_1) \leq \cdots \leq \tau(j_p)$ and $\operatorname{sgn}(\tau)$ its signature. We denote the set of permutations on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ by $\mathrm{Per}_n$. In this way, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det(M\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, M\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \ldots \mathbf{e}_{a_m}) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1, \ldots, j_p \leq n, \\ \#\{j_1, \ldots, j_p\} = p}} \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{p} M\right)_{\underline{a}^*,\underline{j}'^*} (-1)^{\underline{a}+((p+1)+\cdots+n)} \operatorname{sgn}(\tau) \mathbf{x}_1^{(j_1)} \cdots \mathbf{x}_p^{(j_p)} \\
&= \sum_{\underline{j}=j_1\wedge\ldots\wedge j_p \in \mathcal{O}_p} \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{p} M\right)_{\underline{a}^*,\underline{j}'^*} (-1)^{\underline{a}+((p+1)+\cdots+n)} \sum_{\substack{\tau \in \mathrm{Per}_n, \\ \tau(j'_k) = j'_k \\ (1 \leq k \leq m)}} \operatorname{sgn}(\tau) \mathbf{x}_1^{(\tau(j_1))} \cdots \mathbf{x}_p^{(\tau(j_p))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau \in \mathrm{Per}_n, \\ \tau(j'_k) = j'_k \\ (1 \leq k \leq m)}} \operatorname{sgn}(\tau) \mathbf{x}_1^{(\tau(j_1))} \cdots \mathbf{x}_p^{(\tau(j_p))} = (-1)^{\underline{j}'+((p+1)+\cdots+n)} \det(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{e}_{j'_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{j'_m}),$$

which leads to the desired equality, after renaming $\underline{j}' \leftrightarrow \underline{b}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\det(M\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, M\mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \ldots \mathbf{e}_{a_m}) \\
&= \sum_{\underline{b}=b_1\wedge\ldots\wedge b_m \in \mathcal{O}_m} \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{p} M\right)_{\underline{a}^*,\underline{b}^*} (-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}} \det(\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{e}_{b_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{e}_{b_m}).
\end{aligned}$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 4.7.* Let $\mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u}_n$ be a basis of $\mathbb{K}_n$ made of eigenvectors of $M_\sigma$ for the associated eigenvalues $\zeta_{d+1}, \ldots, \zeta_n$. Also, let $\mathbf{v}_{d+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n$ be eigenvectors of ${}^tM_\sigma$ for the associated eigenvalues $\zeta_{d+1}, \ldots, \zeta_n$, normalized to have $\mathbf{u}_k \cdot \mathbf{v}_k = 1$ for $k \in \{d+1, \ldots, n\}$. Since $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n$ are all orthogonal to the contracting space $\mathbb{K}_c$, the following equality holds for every $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{d-1} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}$:

$$\lambda_{d-1}(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}})) = \frac{\left|\det\left(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n, \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_1}), \ldots, \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}})\right)\right|}{\lambda_{n-d+1}\left(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n\right)}. \tag{A.1}$$

Here, $\lambda_p$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on the $p$-dimensional space and

$$\lambda_{n-d+1}\left(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n\right) =: 1/K_0$$

is the measure of the parallelotope generated by the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n$.

Note that for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we have the decomposition

$$\mathbf{x} = \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_1 \rangle \mathbf{u}_1 + \sum_{i=d+1}^{n} \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}_i \rangle \mathbf{u}_i + \pi_c(\mathbf{x}). \tag{A.2}$$

We use the above decomposition for the vectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{n-d+1}$ and expand the determinant by multilinearity to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{d-1}(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}})) &= \underbrace{K_0 \det\left(\langle \mathbf{v}_k, \mathbf{v}_l \rangle_{k,l=1,d+1,\dots,n}\right)}_{=:K} \\ &\quad \cdot \left|\det(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_1}), \dots, \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}}))\right|. \end{aligned}$$

The terms containing $\pi_c(\mathbf{v}_k)$ vanished for each value of $k \in \{1, d+1, \dots, n\}$), since the $d$ vectors $\pi_c(\mathbf{v}_k), \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_1}), \dots, \pi_c(\mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}})$ are linearly dependent in the $d-1$-dimensional space $\mathbb{K}_c$. Using now (A.2) for the vectors $\mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}}$, we can simplify the last expression to

$$\lambda_{d-1}(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}})) = K \left|\det(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}})\right|. \tag{A.3}$$

Now, by (N), $g(0) = 1 = \Pi_{k=d+1}^{n} \zeta_k$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}}) &= \frac{1}{\beta} \det(\beta \mathbf{u}_1, \zeta_{d+1}\mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \zeta_n \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\beta} \det(M_\sigma \mathbf{u}_1, M_\sigma \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, M_\sigma \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.1, we can relate the last determinant to $\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} M_\sigma$: for all $\underline{a} = a_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{d-1} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\det(M_\sigma \mathbf{u}_1, M_\sigma \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, M_\sigma \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}}) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{b} = b_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge b_{d-1} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} M_\sigma \right)_{\underline{a}^*, \underline{b}^*} (-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}} \det(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{b_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{b_{d-1}}) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{b} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}} \left( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} {}^t M_\sigma \right)_{\underline{b}^*, \underline{a}^*} (-1)^{\underline{a}^*+\underline{b}^*} \det(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{b_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{b_{d-1}}) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{b} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}} (M_{d-1})_{\underline{b}, \underline{a}} \det(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{b_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{b_{d-1}}). \end{aligned}$$

We used here that $(-1)^{\underline{a}+\underline{b}} = (-1)^{\underline{a}^*+\underline{b}^*}$. By the above computation, this means that the vector

$$\mathbf{V} = \left(\det(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_{d+1}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n, \mathbf{e}_{a_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{a_{d-1}})\right)_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}}$$

is an eigenvector of ${}^t M_{d-1}$ for the eigenvalue $\beta$. It follows that

$$\beta |\mathbf{V}| = |{}^t M_{d-1} \mathbf{V}| \leq |{}^t M_{d-1}| |\mathbf{V}|.$$

Now, it follows from (3.5) and (P) that $|{}^t M_{d-1}| = \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-d+1} M_\sigma$ is a primitive matrix. Therefore, by Lemma 4.6, $\beta$ is its Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue. Consequently, the inequality $\beta |\mathbf{V}| \leq |{}^t M_{d-1}| |\mathbf{V}|$ is an equality and

$$\left(\lambda_{d-1}(\pi_c(\overline{\mathbf{0}, \underline{a}}))\right)_{\underline{a} \in \mathcal{O}_{d-1}} = K |\mathbf{V}|$$

is an eigenvector of $|{}^t M_{d-1}|$ for the eigenvalue $\beta$. □

**Acknowledgements.** The authors are grateful to Jörg Thuswaldner for the precious help and many inspiring discussions which contributed to the creation of this paper, to Valérie Berthé for reading carefully a preliminary version and for giving remarkable comments, and to Pierre Arnoux for many fruitful discussions.

## References

[ABB11] P. Arnoux, J. Bernat, and X. Bressaud, *Geometrical models for substitutions*, Exp. Math. **20** (2011), no. 1, 97–127.

[ABB+15] S. Akiyama, M. Barge, V. Berthé, J.-Y. Lee, and A. Siegel, *On the Pisot substitution conjecture*, Mathematics of aperiodic order, Progr. Math., vol. 309, Birkhäuser/Springer, Basel, 2015, pp. 33–72.

[ABFJ07] P. Arnoux, V. Berthé, T. Fernique, and D. Jamet, *Functional stepped surfaces, flips, and generalized substitutions*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **380** (2007), no. 3, 251–265.

[AFHI11] P. Arnoux, M. Furukado, E. Harriss, and S. Ito, *Algebraic numbers, free group automorphisms and substitutions on the plane*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011), no. 9, 4651–4699.

[AI01] P. Arnoux and S. Ito, *Pisot substitutions and Rauzy fractals*, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin **8** (2001), no. 2, 181–207, Journées Montoises d'Informatique Théorique (Marne-la-Vallée, 2000).

[Bar15] M. Barge, *The Pisot conjecture for beta-substitutions*, arXiv:1505.04408, preprint, 2015.

[Bar16] ———, *Pure discrete spectrum for a class of one-dimensional substitution tiling systems*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **36** (2016), no. 3, 1159–1173. MR 3431249

[BBJS12] M. Barge, H. Bruin, L. Jones, and L. Sadun, *Homological Pisot substitutions and exact regularity*, Israel J. Math. **188** (2012), 281–300.

[BBJS16] V. Berthé, J. Bourdon, T. Jolivet, and A. Siegel, *A combinatorial approach to products of Pisot substitutions*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **36** (2016), no. 6, 1757–1794.

[BBK06] V. Baker, M. Barge, and J. Kwapisz, *Geometric realization and coincidence for reducible non-unimodular Pisot tiling spaces with an application to $\beta$-shifts*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **56** (2006), no. 7, 2213–2248, Numération, pavages, substitutions.

[BD14] V. Berthé and V. Delecroix, *Beyond substitutive dynamical systems: $S$-adic expansions*, Numeration and substitution 2012, RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu, B46, Res. Inst. Math. Sci. (RIMS), Kyoto, 2014, pp. 81–123.

[BF11] V. Berthé and T. Fernique, *Brun expansions of stepped surfaces*, Discrete Math. **311** (2011), no. 7, 521–543.

[BS05] V. Berthé and A. Siegel, *Tilings associated with beta-numeration and substitutions*, Integers **5** (2005), no. 3, A2, 46.

[BST10] V. Berthé, A. Siegel, and J. Thuswaldner, *Substitutions, Rauzy fractals and tilings*, Combinatorics, automata and number theory, Encyclopedia Math. Appl., vol. 135, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2010, pp. 248–323.

[BST14] V. Berthé, W. Steiner, and J.M. Thuswaldner, *Geometry, dynamics and arithmetic of $S$-adic shifts*, arXiv:1410.0331v1, preprint, 2014.

[CS01] V. Canterini and A. Siegel, *Geometric representation of substitutions of Pisot type*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 12, 5121–5144.

[DT89] J.-M. Dumont and A. Thomas, *Systemes de numeration et fonctions fractales relatifs aux substitutions*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **65** (1989), no. 2, 153–169.

[EI05] H. Ei and S. Ito, *Tilings from some non-irreducible, Pisot substitutions*, Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. **7** (2005), no. 1, 81–121 (electronic).

[EIR06] H. Ei, S. Ito, and H. Rao, *Atomic surfaces, tilings and coincidences. II. Reducible case*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **56** (2006), no. 7, 2285–2313, Numération, pavages, substitutions.

[Fer06] T. Fernique, *Multidimensional Sturmian sequences and generalized substitutions*, Internat. J. Found. Comput. Sci. **17** (2006), no. 3, 575–599.

[FIR06] M. Furukado, S. Ito, and E. A. Robinson, Jr., *Tilings associated with non-Pisot matrices*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **56** (2006), no. 7, 2391–2435, Numération, pavages, substitutions.

[Fra08] N. P. Frank, *A primer of substitution tilings of the Euclidean plane*, Expo. Math. **26** (2008), no. 4, 295–326.

[Fre05] D. Frettlöh, *Duality of model sets generated by substitutions*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. **50** (2005), no. 5-6, 619–639.

[FS92] C. Frougny and B. Solomyak, *Finite beta-expansions*, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems **12** (1992), no. 4, 713–723.

[Fur06] M. Furukado, *Tilings from non-Pisot unimodular matrices*, Hiroshima Math. J. **36** (2006), no. 2, 289–329.

[Hat02] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic topology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[IO93] S. Ito and M. Ohtsuki, *Modified Jacobi-Perron algorithm and generating Markov partitions for special hyperbolic toral automorphisms*, Tokyo J. Math. **16** (1993), no. 2, 441–472.

[IO94] ———, *Parallelogram tilings and Jacobi-Perron algorithm*, Tokyo J. Math. **17** (1994), no. 1, 33–58.

[IR06] S. Ito and H. Rao, *Atomic surfaces, tilings and coincidence. I. Irreducible case*, Israel J. Math. **153** (2006), 129–155.

[LW03] J. C. Lagarias and Y. Wang, *Substitution Delone sets*, Discrete Comput. Geom. **29** (2003), no. 2, 175–209.

[MT14] M. Minervino and J. M. Thuswaldner, *The geometry of non-unit Pisot substitutions*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **64** (2014), no. 4, 1373–1417.

[Que10] M. Queffélec, *Substitution dynamical systems—spectral analysis*, second ed., Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1294, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.

[Rau82] G. Rauzy, *Nombres algébriques et substitutions*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **110** (1982), no. 2, 147–178.

[Rau84] R. Rauzy, *Ensembles à restes bornés*, Seminar on number theory, 1983–1984 (Talence, 1983/1984), Univ. Bordeaux I, Talence, 1984, pp. Exp. No. 24, 12.

[Rev91] J.-P. Reveillès, *Géométrie discrète, calcul en nombres entiers et algorithmique*, Thèse de Doctorat, Université Louis Pasteur, Strasbourg, 1991.

[SAI01] Y. Sano, P. Arnoux, and S. Ito, *Higher dimensional extensions of substitutions and their dual maps*, J. Anal. Math. **83** (2001), 183–206.

[Sol05] B. Solomyak, *Pseudo-self-affine tilings in* $\mathbb{R}^d$, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **326** (2005), no. Teor. Predst. Din. Sist. Komb. i Algoritm. Metody. 13, 198–213, 282–283.

[ST09] A. Siegel and J.M. Thuswaldner, *Topological properties of Rauzy fractals*, Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.) (2009), no. 118, 140.

[Thu06] J. M. Thuswaldner, *Unimodular Pisot substitutions and their associated tiles*, J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux **18** (2006), no. 2, 487–536.

(B. Loridant) Lehrstuhl Mathematik und Statistik, Montanuniversität Leoben, Franz Josef Strasse 18, 8700 Leoben, Austria

*E-mail address*: benoit.loridant@unileoben.ac.at

(M. Minervino) Institut de Mathématiques de Marseille (UMR 7373), Campus de Luminy, Case 907, 13288 Marseille Cedex 9, France

*E-mail address*: milton.minervino@univ-amu.fr